THE GERMANIA OF TACITUS,

WITH

ETHNOLOGICAL DISSERTATIONS AND NOTES.

By R. G. LATHAM, M.D., F.R.S.,

LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, MEMBER OF THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

LONDON:

TAYLOR, WALTON, AND MABERLY,

UPPER GOWER STREET, AND IVY LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1851.

LONDON:
Printed by SAMUEL BENTLEY and Co.,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

PREFACE.

THE methods of ethnological investigation in the present volume are best collected from the text.

The result is a Germany of very different magnitude from that of the usual commentators.

If this be unsatisfactory, there is still some gain to the cause of scholarship.

The extent to which migrations may be unnecessarily assumed, or reasonably dispensed with, is measured; so that, to draw a comparison from the exact sciences, an ethnological work without great migrations is like a geometry without axioms.

The extent of the difficulties and assumptions of the existing belief as to the magnitude of ancient Germany may also be measured.

The value I put upon the great writers of Germany on the same subject—Zeuss, Grimm, Niebuhr—is *not* thus measured.

I rarely mention except to differ with them.

As a set-off to this, I may add that, it is almost wholly by means of their own weapons that they are combated.

Whether the present work took its present form, or

that of a translation of Zeuss's learned and indispensable work,* with an elaborate commentary, was a mere question of convenience.

To it I am under the same obligations as the learner of a language is to his grammar, his lexicon, or his text-book; and it is not saying too much to add that nineteen out of twenty of the references and quotations are Zeuss's.

What applies to Zeuss applies, in a less degree, to Grimm and Niebuhr.

Nevertheless, though the materials are the same, the structure is as different as a ship is from a barn, or *vice versâ*, both built from the same forest.

That the present results have taken a completely definite and systematic form is more than I think.

Everything in ethnology is a balance between conflicting difficulties, and I can only hope that I have approached a full and complete exhibition of the ethnology of ancient Germany.

Perhaps, too, the work is rather a commentary upon the geographical part of the *Germania*, than on the *Germania* itself—the purely descriptive part relating to the customs of the early Germans being passed over almost *sicco pede*.

The real difficulties lay in the geography, and the classificational portion of the ethnology; besides which it is there where I worked with the most confidence.

The chief texts are given in full. To have fol-

* *Die Deutschen und Die Nachbarstämme.*
The *Deutsche Mythologie*, of Grimm, is quoted as D. M.
The *Deutsche Sprache* as D. S.

lowed them up with the same amount of commentary as is attached to the text of Tacitus, would have trebled the size of the work. In the case of Jornandes and Paulus Diaconus there has been an additional reason for giving the chief passages at large. The evidently heterogeneous character of their notices and remarks is intended to exhibit, in a practical point of view, their value as authorities.

In one respect I may appear to have understated the case that can be made out by the advocates of what may be called the German theory in its broadest form. One of the strong arms of their argument is, the etymological deduction of names like *Suevi*, *Lygii*, &c., from supposed German roots. Specimens of these derivations may be found incidentally throughout the work. In the eyes of such readers as they satisfy, I have done less than justice to the views of their devisers. But, if the samples* in question be (as they are believed to be) fair specimens of the whole, I have but little fear that the neglect of them will lay me open to the charge of keeping back any very valid arguments on the opposite side.

It should be added that the order in which the different geographical and national names of the *Epilegomena* are taken is what may be called *logical*, *i.e.*, those populations which illustrate each other, and which are subject to the same lines of criticism, are grouped together, sometimes (but not often) to the violation of geographical proximity, and ethnological

* In the words *Saxon*, *Frank*, *Dulgibini*, *Nuithones*, and others.

affinity. Thus the *Juthungi* and *Jutes*, the *Franks* and *Varangi* are noticed in succession. This is not because they are really connected, but because they are most conveniently considered when thrown in such groups.

Being unwilling that it should appear to be Tacitus, rather than his commentators, whose authority I impugn, I must remind the reader, that the question is not whether certain nations of the Germania are rightly placed therein, but whether Tacitus's test of Germanism was the same as ours; and whether, if different, more correct. Two populations who, according to his own showing, would not be German in the eyes of a modern ethnologist, are especially stated to have been so in his—*viz.*, the *Osi* and the *Æstii*, and I only urge the probability of the *Lygii* and others being in the same predicament.

CONTENTS.

PROLEGOMENA.

THE TEXT AND NOTES.

EPILEGOMENA.

APPENDICES.

In *one* point, however, the order is natural. It represents the *relationship*, *affinity*, or *affiliation* between the six *forms of speech*; so that the Norse *dialects* are the most like the Frisian, the Frisian the English, the English the Dutch and Low German, and the Low German the High.

§ II. DIFFERENT STAGES OF THE DIFFERENT LANGUAGES OF THE FAMILIES AND NATIONS DESCENDED FROM, OR ALLIED TO, THE GERMANS OF TACITUS.

Some of the tongues just enumerated were reduced to *writing* many centuries ago. In this case we have specimens of them in an earlier stage of their growth; the difference between the older and the newer forms of speech being, in many instances, sufficient to constitute a *fresh language*. Thus the English, in its oldest known form, is Anglo-Saxon; yet the Anglo-Saxon is so different from the present English as to be unintelligible to the unlearned reader.

Again; certain dialects, which were once cultivated, may have ceased to be spoken—have become *extinct*. In this case, we have an ancient tongue without any modern representative; whereas, in certain provincial dialects, which have never been written at all, we have a modern form of speech, without any specimen of it during its earlier growth. All this introduces fresh objects of consideration, *viz.*:—the notice of the different *stages* of language, or the *descent* of one form of speech from another.

When Tacitus mentions such nations as the Chauci and Cherusci, we are induced to ask whether any of the present populations may be their representatives or descendants; and so on with the others. Or we may change the form of the inquiry, and, after enumerating such modern divisions as the *English*, the *Dutch*, or the *High-German*, may investigate their parentage, and ask what they each were at some earlier period of their respective histories.

The descent of the Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish is from a language somewhat difficult to designate. It is the *mother-tongue of the present Icelandic*; which, in the ninth century, seems to have been spoken, with but little variation,

over the whole of Scandinavia. Changes, however, set in. In the three kingdoms they went on so as for two,* or more, new languages to have been evolved. In Iceland, however, the contrary took place. The changes were so inconsiderable as to leave the present Icelandic nearly in the same state in which it was first introduced into the island; a fact which has engendered the somewhat lax statement of the *Icelandic being the mother-tongue of the present Danish and Swedish.* The truer statement would be that the *Icelandic* is the *unaltered representative of a mother-tongue common to Iceland, the Faroe Isles, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.*

The descent of the present Frisian is from the Old Frisian; a language of which we have specimens as early as the thirteenth century.

The descent of the present English is from the Anglo-Saxon; a language of which we have specimens as old as the eighth century.

The descent of the present Dutch of Holland is from the Old Dutch; a language of which the oldest specimen is no older than the thirteenth century.

The descent of the present Platt-Deutsch is from the old dialects of the Lower Rhine; the oldest specimens of which are no older than the thirteenth century.

The descent of the present High German is from the old dialects of Hesse, Baden, Wurtemburg, and Bavaria; the oldest specimens of which are as old as the eighth century.

With these preliminaries, we find that out of the existing languages the majority can be traced upwards to a certain point; the Old High German further than the Low, the Frisian as far as the Dutch, and the English further than the Frisian; a fact which leads us to speak of the *Old* Frisian as opposed to the *Middle* Frisian, and the *Middle* Frisian as opposed to the *New;* and so on throughout. But as this distinction is of subordinate importance in ethnology, it will not be further illustrated.

Instead of pursuing it any longer let us see what follows

* The present Danish and Swedish, together with the numerous unwritten dialects.

from taking up the question at the other end, beginning with a language at the earliest period of its history, inverting the previous process, and tracing its progress downwards from its first appearance in history to the present time.

We get, by this means, more than one additional Gothic language. First and foremost comes—

1. *The Mœso-Gothic.*—The tribes who spoke this were the Goths who conquered Mœsia; the date of its existence, as a written language, being the fourth century. The Mœso-Gothic has no living representative, that is, none of the present dialects of Germany are directly and unequivocally descended from it; although the Thuringian is, probably, descended from some dialect originally allied to it. From the fact of its being the oldest Gothic dialect of which we have any specimen, the philological importance of the Mœso-Gothic is very great.

2. *The Alemannic.*—This is the present literary German as it was written in the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, and as it was spoken on the Upper Rhine,—in Baden, Wurtemburg, Switzerland, and Bavaria.

3. *The Francic.*—This is German of the middle Rhine, as it was written in the ninth and tenth centuries.

4. *The Old Dutch, Flemish, or Batavian.*—This is the present Dutch of Holland in its oldest form. It departs from the Francic much as the Francic departs from the Alemannic. Hence the Dutch of Holland, and the Bavarian of Bavaria, may be considered as the two extreme forms of one and the same * group. All the present Platt-Deutsch dialects of Germany are either exactly derived from the Francic, or from some form intermediate to the Francic and Batavian: a view which will be noticed in the sequel.

5. *The Saxon.*—This falls into two divisions, the Old-Saxon of Westphalia, and the Anglo-Saxon of Hanover, afterwards transplanted to Great Britain. The Saxon language is extinct in Germany, being replaced by the Platt-Deutsch derivatives of the Francic, or Franco-Batavian. This circumstance supplies us with a principle of classification, the Platt-Deutsch dialect falling into two divisions—

* Viz., the *German Proper.*—See p. ix.

a, the Platt-Deutsch dialect of the original *Platt-Deutsch* area—*b*, the Platt-Deutsch dialects of the originally *Saxon* area. It was Charlemagne who extended the Frank Germans at the expense of the Saxons, otherwise the present dialects of Westphalia and Hanover would be *English*, or at least *Anglican* or *Angliform*.

6. *The Old Frisian.*—The old language of Friesland is known to us through the Old Frisian laws; chiefly representing the language of *East* Friesland. Of the Middle Frisian we have specimens in the writings of Gysbert Japicx, a poet of the seventeenth century.

The older the stage of the Frisian, the more closely it approaches the Anglo-Saxon and the Old Saxon.

Of the three divisions of the languages of Germany, it is the Hanoverian which most closely approaches the more northern tongues of Scandinavia.

7. *Old Norse, Old Scandinavian, or Icelandic.*—This is the well-known language of a rich literature, consisting chiefly in the alliterative poems of the *Skalds*, and the prose narratives—fictional, historical, or domestic—of the *Sagamen*.

§ III. ON THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE PRECEDING FORMS OF SPEECH.—THE TERM *GOTHIC*.

The great and important class which comprises these divisions, is called *Gothic;* because it was under the name of *Goths* that some of the most important of the Germanic populations were known to the Romans. It was the Ostro-*Goths* of Alaric and Theodoric, and the Visi-*Goths* of Euric and others, who insulted the declining majesty of Rome, and founded the Gothic kingdoms of Italy, Spain, and southern Gaul; and although other tribes of equal importance contributed to the downfall of the Western Empire, the term in question is, on the whole, not very inconvenient.

The classification of the Gothic tongues is of two sorts.

We may take the leading characteristics of certain groups, such as differences of grammatical structure, differences in the way of their vocabulary, or differences in respect to their system of sounds, and so make out the necessary number

of classes. We may even admit the consideration of certain external circumstances, such as literary development, and political separation. This makes the arrangement more or less artificial.

Be this, however, as it may, the following is a classification of the kind in question.

a. The Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian dialects (written and unwritten), the Faroic and the Icelandic, form the Scandinavian branch of the Gothic stock.

b. The Frisian, Old-Saxon, Anglo-Saxon, English, Lowland Scotch, Dutch of Holland, Platt-Deutsch, and High German, form the Teutonic branch of the same.

Of course these again fall into subdivisions, according to the date of the specimen, *e.g.*, there is the Old Frisian, Middle Frisian, and New Frisian; Semi-Saxon, Old English, Middle English, and Modern English; the Mœso-Gothic, Alemannic, &c.

The disadvantage of this method is that, in attempting to draw definite lines of demarcation between the different divisions, it disturbs the history of the languages, and disguises the order of their evolution. Thus the Frisian, a member of the Teutonic branch, is undoubtedly more like certain Scandinavian dialects than it is to the more extreme members of its own division.

Such being the case, a fresh view is required, and this is best given by placing the tongues in a linear series according to their affinities, and treating them as if (as is really the case) they passed into each other by insensible degrees.

Hence, the more convenient, as well as the more natural series, is that of the first chapter, *viz.*

1. Norse. 2. Frisian. 3. Old Saxon. 4. Anglo-Saxon. 5, 6. Platt-Deutsch and the Dutch of Holland. 7. High German. 8. Mœso-Gothic.

The general characteristics of these divisions and subdivisions of the Gothic tongues, in respect to the differences of their systems of elementary sounds, their grammatical structure, and their vocabularies, are in the department of philology. One or two isolated points, however, have a practical bearing upon certain ethnological details.

1. The use of *p* and *k* for *b* and *g* respectively is High German rather than Low, and of the High German dialects more particularly Bavarian.

COMMON HIGH GERMAN.	BAVARIAN.	ENGLISH.
*B*erg...	*P*ir*k*	Hill (*berg*).
*B*aiern	*P*aiern	Bavaria.
*B*lin*d*	*P*lin*t*	Blind.
*G*ott...	*K*ott	God.
*G*e-*b*ir*g*-e	*K*e-*p*ir*k*-i	Range of hills, &c.

2. The use of *-t* or *-tt* for *-s* or *-ss* is Low German, in opposition to High; as—

PLATT-DEUTSCH.	HIGH GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
Wa*t*er	Wa*ss*er	Wa*t*er.
Swê*t* ...	Schwei*ss*...	Sweat.
He*t* ...	E*s*	I*t*.

And, on the strength of the assumption which this letter-change allows:—

PLATT-DEUTSCH.	HIGH GERMAN.
Ca*tt*i ...	He*ss*e, &c.

What applies to the Platt-Deutsch, generally, applies *a fortiori* to the Saxon, Frisian, and Norse.

3. The Frisian chiefly differs from the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon in the forms of the plural noun and in the termination of the infinitive mood.

The plurals which in Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon end in *-s*, in Frisian end in *-r*.

The infinitives, which in Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon end in *-an*, in Frisian end in *-a*.

ANGLO-SAXON.	FRISIAN.	ENGLISH.
Cyning-*as*	Kening-*ar*	King-*s*.
Bærn-*an*	Bærn-*a*	Burn.

4. In Norse the preference for the sound of *-r* to *-s*, and of *-a* to *-an* is carried further than even in Frisian.

5. But the great characteristics of the Norse tongues, as opposed to the Frisian, and, *a fortiori*, to all the others, are,

the so called passive voice, and the so-called *post*-positive article.

a. The reflective pronoun *sik* = *se* = *self* coalesces with the verb, and so forms a *reflective* termination. In the later stages this reflective (or middle) becomes passive in power. *Kalla* = *call*, and *sig* = *self*. Hence come *kalla sig*, *kallasc*, *kallast*, *kallas*; so that in the modern Swedish *jag kallas* = *I am called* = *vocor*.

b. The definite article in Norse not only *follows* its substantive, but amalgamates with it; *e.g.*, *bord* = *table*, *hit* = *the* or *that*; *bord-et* = *the table* (*board*).

If higher groups than those already suggested be required, we may say that—

1. The *Norse* branch contains the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Faroic, and Icelandic.

2. The *Saxon* branch, the Old Frisian, the Old Saxon, the Anglo-Saxon, and their respective descendants.

3. The *German Proper*, the Platt-Deutsch (and Dutch of Holland), the High German, and the Mœso-Gothic.

The paramount fact, however, is, the transitional character of the Frisian in respect to the Norse.

§ IV. ON THE VALUE OF LANGUAGE AS A TEST OF ETHNOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIP.

Such prominence has been given to the phenomena of language and dialect in the preceding pages, that it may not be superfluous to justify the exclusive attention which has been directed to them; and in doing this a qualification of their value as tests of relationship will be added.

It would be an undue exaggeration of the importance of the philological method to say, that it should supersede all others, and that the degrees of similarity in language exactly coincided with the degrees of ethnological relationship. They are *primâ facie* evidence of this — strong *primâ facie* evidence—but nothing more.

Taking the world at large, there are numerous well-known and extreme instances of a native language having been unlearned, and a foreign one adopted in its stead; *e.g.*, the

Blacks of St. Domingo speak French and Spanish. But, not to go so far, no man believes that every inhabitant of the British Principality who speaks English, to the exclusion of Welsh, is as Anglo-Saxon in blood and pedigree as he is in tongue. Neither does he think this in respect to his Scotch and Irish fellow-citizens. Indeed, every man who, being born of parents of different nations, speaks only *one* language, is more national in his speech than he is in his origin.

Within the limits of Germany itself this distinction is not only well illustrated, but it must necessarily be borne in mind.

What is the history of our own language? Throughout the whole length and breadth of continental Germany there is not only no dialect that can be called English, but — undeniably as our Anglo-Saxon mother-tongue was German in origin — there is no dialect which can be said to have originated in the same source; no descendant of the Angle form of speech.

The same applies to the allied dialect of the Old Saxons. Where that was once spoken, Platt-Deutsch and High German are now the exclusive idioms; no descendants from anything Saxon, but descendants from members of the Proper German groups.

Extinct as are these two dialects, it is by no means reasonable to imagine a similar extinction of Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon blood. Difficult as the traces of it are to detect, they may fairly be supposed to exist.

What applies to the Anglo-Saxon and the Old-Saxon applies to the Mœso-Gothic also.

Though no existing dialect can be traced to it, it cannot be doubted but that the blood of the ancestors of the Ostro-Goths and Visi-Goths must run in the veins of some southern Germans—few or many as the case may be.

Hence the evidence of language is *primâ facie* evidence only.

Such is the measure of its *absolute* value—a measure which subtracts from its importance.

But what if language be the *only* test we have; or, if not the only one, the one whose value transcends that of all the

rest put together. In such a case, it regains its importance; its *relative* value being thus heightened.

And such is the fact. No differences of physical appearance, intellectual habits, or moral characteristics will give us the same elements of classification that we find in the study of the Germanic languages and dialects. They may, perhaps, have done so once, when there was a variety of Pagan creeds and several self-evolved and, consequently, characteristic laws. But they do not do so now. A value they have, but that value is a subordinate one.

§ V. PRESENT DISTRIBUTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF FAMILIES AND NATIONS DESCENDED FROM, OR ALLIED TO, THE SARMATÆ OF TACITUS.

The three great recognized families from which Tacitus separates the Germans, and with which he contrasts them, are —1. The Gauls or Kelts—2. The Finns—3. The Sarmatians: this last term being used, by the present writer, in a more definite sense than the one which it bore with the ancients. *Here* it comprises the Slavonians of Bohemia, Silesia, Poland, Gallicia, Russia, Servia, Croatia, Carniola, Hungary, Prussia, and Bulgaria, and something more. It comprises the Lithuanians, Courlanders, Livonians, and Old Prussians as well.

The Sarmatians, Finns, and Gauls are the three *great recognized* families from which Tacitus separates, and with which he contrasts, the *Germans*. But are they not the only ones? He notices the *Dacians*, the *Pannonians*, and the *Rhætians* as well. It is only, however, the Sarmatians that at present require a special preliminary investigation.

The two primary divisions into which the great Sarmatian stock falls are—1. The Slavonic—2. The Lithuanic.

The details of the Lithuanic branch will be found in the sequel.

The details of the Slavonic branch are numerous, complicated, and important.

First and foremost comes the notice of their present geographical distribution.

Geographically, they fall into two large divisions, *separated*

from each other — one of which lies wholly to the *north*, the other, wholly to the *south* of the Danube.

North of the Danube, reckoning from west to east, come—

A. 1. The Tshekhs, or Bohemians of Bohemia.

2. The Moravians, or the Tshekhs of Moravia, nearly identical with the Bohemians—the two languages being but sub-dialects of the common Tshekh tongue.

3. The Slovaks of Upper Hungary, differing more from the Bohemians and Moravians than those two nations do from each other, but still belonging to the great Tshekh or Bohemian division. The dialects and sub-dialects of the Slovak language are as numerous as the Slovak villages; a fact from which some inferences will be drawn in the sequel.

The Tshekh division is limited to Bohemia, Moravia, and Upper Hungary. Both northwards and eastwards, the character of the language changes.

B. Silesia, even at the present moment, is not wholly German. The Serkie of Lower and the Srbie of Upper Lusatia are Slavonic. They do not, however, belong to the Tshekh so much as to the Lekh, or Polish branch. Hence their affinities are with their north-eastern rather than with their south-western neighbours.

1, 2. The Serke and Serbs are the most south-western members now in existence of the Lekh branch of the Slavonic stock; a division which takes the form of a separate substantive nationality with—

3. The Poles of Poland, Posen, parts of Gallicia, parts of Lithuania, and parts of Pomerania.

C. Russian. A modified form of the *Russian*, called Rusniak, or Ruthenian—occurs as far west as Gallicia, where it is in contact with the Slovak of Upper Hungary and the Polish of Poland. Further to the north it is bounded by the Lithuanian of Lithuania, Courland, and Livonia, and by the Esthonian of Esthonia—this last being a Finnic language. Vast as is the area covered by the Russian language, its dialects are remarkably few; a fact which should be contrasted with the multiplicity of dialects in the Slovak.

And here the north-Slavonic area ends; an area which we may, if we choose, call *Trans*-Danubian, since all the

countries which it comprises lie on the north side of that river.

South of the Danube, reckoning from west to east, come—

1. The Slavonians of Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, and south-western Hungary. Differing but slightly from—

2. The Croatians—themselves the speakers of a language which extends, with but few variations of dialect, from the Adriatic to the Euxine—the language of the Montenegrino mountaineers on the frontier of Albania, the Dalmatians, the Herzegovinians, the Bosniacs, the Servians, the southern Hungarians, the Slavonians of Slavonia at the junction of the Save and Danube, and the Bulgarians.

The Slavonic languages, like the Germanic, must be studied in respect to their history as well as their geographical distribution—in respect to *time* as well as *place*. In this respect, the fact which has the most important application is connected with the southern division of them. It was in a Servian, Croatian, or Dalmatian, dialect that Christianity was first preached, and the first scriptural translations made. Hence, the so-called old Slavonic has the same importance in Russian and Servian philology as the Mœso-Gothic has in German.

The northern frontier of the south-Slavonic area is formed by a line running through Styria, Southern Hungary, and the northern part of Bulgaria; the southern frontier of the northern by Bohemia, Moravia, Gallicia, Volhynia, and Podolia; the intermediate *non*-Slavonic countries being Hungary, Wallachia, and Moldavia.

The Hungarians, or Majiars, are of Finnic origin, and constitute an intrusive population, the date of their intrusion being the tenth century.

The Wallachians, Moldavians, and Bessarabians are partially at least of Latin origin, and, so far as they are so, they constitute, like the Majiars, an intrusive population, the date of their intrusion being the second century, *i.e.*, the time of Trajan the conqueror of Dacia.

We have seen that, in respect to their geographical distribution, the Russians, Poles, and Bohemians, belong to one division, the Servians and Slavonians to another. Is

this the case in ethnology? No. The Russian language, although northern in locality, is southern in structure, being more akin to the Servian, with which it is *not* in contact, than the Polish with which it *is*. Nay, more, the older the specimens of the language the more it approaches the Old Church-language, or the Old Slavonic.

§ VI. ON THE DATE OF THE DIFFUSION OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE OVER RUSSIA.

This is by no means an irrelevant question even in German ethnology. For that of southern Europe and Asia it is all-important.

The greater the area we give to the Germans of Tacitus, the less room we leave for the numerous Sarmatian populations now in existence; and the less room we leave for these, the greater the difficulty of accounting for their wide diffusion.

By supposing, however, that they originated in so large a country as Russia we meet this difficulty, since we thereby allow ourselves a vast tract of land to draw upon for the several migrations necessary to account for the present presence of Poles in Poland, Serbs in Silesia, Tsheks in Bohemia, Slovaks in Hungary, and Carinthians, Croatians, and Dalmatians, elsewhere.

But what if the internal evidence derived from the paucity of Russian dialects, or (changing the expression) the uniformity of that tongue over a vast area indicate—as such phenomena *do* indicate—a recent introduction and a rapid diffusion? In this case, the difficulty remains as before, and we must not only exclude a great number of Slavonians from the countries of the west, but from the valley of the Dnieper also.

Now, from all that I collect from the language of the best Slavonic scholars, the Russian tongue in Russia seems full as new as the Anglo-Saxon is in England; in other words, its dialects are fewer and less marked than those of the English of Great Britain.

On the other hand, it is in the south and west that such differences are the most marked and the most numerous.

As far, then, as this goes we are unable to draw upon Russia as the source of the Sarmatian populations of the countries in question; a fact which should open our eyes to the difficulties amongst which we place ourselves by too implicitly believing that the ancient Germans originally extended indefinitely far eastwards.

Neither can we go too far *north* for the parent country of the Slavonians—since, as late as the tenth century, we have historical evidence in favour of the Finnic stock having extended as far south as the Valdai mountains, between Petersburg and Moscow.

§ VII. DISTRIBUTION OF THE FAMILIES AND NATIONS DESCENDED FROM, OR ALLIED TO, THE SARMATÆ OF TACITUS IN THE NINTH CENTURY.

To understand the import of this chapter, it is necessary, in the first place, to bear in mind the distinction between first-hand and second-hand evidence; and, in the second, to appreciate the full import of the *palæontological* character of ethnological reasoning—the palæontological method meaning the method of reasoning from effect to cause, rather than from cause to effect. The geologist understands this at once. The historian requires it to be pointed out.

Now, such information as we collect from Tacitus concerning the Cherusci, Chauci, Frisii, and the other nations of the Lower Rhine and Weser, is of very different value from his statement concerning the Semnones, Lemovii, and the nations beyond the Elbe. The former was collected, either directly or indirectly, from men who visited the localities described, fought in them, marched in them, sailed up their rivers, and acted as pioneers across their fens. The latter are based upon such information as the people of the parts which were known could supply concerning the unknown parts beyond them. As time advanced, however, the more remote countries beyond the Elbe, beyond the Weser, and beyond the Vistula, became known even as the territories of the Catti and Cherusci were known; so that information concerning Pomerania, or Prussia, became as definite

and trustworthy as the earlier information about Hesse and Westphalia.

The period when the parts beyond the Elbe, dimly sketched by Tacitus, first become known in definite detail, and from personal knowledge, is the reign of Charlemagne—some, indeed, earlier, some later; but still the reign of Charlemagne is a convenient era, and an era sufficiently accurate for all present purposes.

Advancing from the dim twilight of a fragmentary and second-hand history to the full light derived from the personal knowledge of contemporary witnesses, the first question which we ask is the extent to which our new knowledge confirms or invalidates our previous accounts. It may do either one or the other. If it confirm them, well and good. If it oppose, a conflict of difficulties arises. In either case, the *existing state of things at the time when our information first becomes unexceptionable* is the primary and fundamental fact with the *ethnologist; indeed*, it is his *primum mobile;* an instrument of criticism which the historian, who is more accustomed to rely upon testimony than to venture upon elaborate trains of reasoning, is not unwilling to accuse him of over-valuing; the ethnologist, on the other hand, imputing to the historian an undue deference to fallible and indistinct testimony.

Such are the preliminary observations which prepare the reader for the statement *that nearly the whole of that portion of the Germania of Tacitus which lies east of the Elbe, as well as certain portions of it west of that river, are, at the beginning of the proper historical period, not Germanic but Slavonic.*

That they are more or less Slavonic in the present century, has been shown already; but that they were so as early as the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries, is a fact not sufficiently appreciated.

The following is a sketch of the details:—

Livonia, Courland, East and West Prussia.—Here the definite history begins with the twelfth century, when the Pagan Lithuanians were converted by the Knights of the Teutonic Order. At that time the whole of the area was

unequivocally Sarmatian, without trace or vestige of any previous Germanic population—no German names for the rivers or mountains, and no Germanic strongholds in any of the impervious forests and impracticable fens,—no traditions on the part of the Sarmatians of their own comparatively recent arrival in the country. That any portion of the present Germanic population of the countries in question is descended from an ancestry earlier than A.D. 800, is what no one has ever ventured to assert, so evidently is it of recent origin, and so totally has any older population—if such ever existed—died off without leaving trace, or shadow of a trace, of its existence.

Pomerania, East of the Oder. — Adam of Bremen first mentions these Pomeranians, and he mentions them as Slavonians, the Oder being their boundary to the west. On the east they were conterminous with the Prussians. Their name is Slavonic, *po = on* and *more = sea, = coastmen.* All their antiquities and traditions are equally so; in other words there is neither evidence, nor shadow of evidence, of their ever having dispossessed an older Germanic population. Nor are they wholly extinct at the present moment. On the promontories which project into the Gulf of Dantzig we find the Slavonic *Kassúb*, *Cassubitæ*, or *Kaszeb.* Their language approaches the Polish.

Pomerania, west of the Oder, and the eastern part of Mecklenburg.—No definite notices of these parts occur before the time of Charlemagne. From that time downwards, however, they are numerous. The only Germans that they recognize are the conquering invaders. On the other hand, the Slavonic populations are carefully enumerated, and so thoroughly do they fill up the whole area that there is neither nook nor cranny for any thing German. The chief nation is that of the Wilzi, Welatabi, or Liutici, falling into the minor divisions of the *Chizzini*, near the present town of Rostock, the *Circipani*, on the coast opposite the Isle of Rugen, the *Tolenzi*, on the Tollensee, and the *Rethrarii* of the *civitas Rethre.* Now, whatever the others may have been, these last were no new-comers, since the town was preeminent for its antiquity, and the temple which it contained celebrated for its sanctity.

The Island of Rugen.—Like the town of Rethre, the Isle of Rugen was at one and the same time Slavonic, and sacred; its sacro-sanctitude implying the antiquity of the rites practised in it.

Coast of Mecklenburg.—Nothing is known of Mecklenburg older than the pre-eminently Slavonic *Obodrites*, separated by the river Warnow from the Wilzi, and by the Trave from the Slavonians of—

Holstein.—Here, for the first time, do we meet with a true Slavono-Germanic frontier. A line drawn from the Trave to the head-waters of the Eyder forms it. North of the Eyder, in the time of Alfred, were the Danes; west of the Trave, the Saxons; between those rivers and the sea, the Slavonic *Wagri*. The city of Altenburg was Wagrian, and so was the Isle of Femern.

Lauenburg.—This was the locality of the Polabi, or Slavonians of the Elbe from *po* = *on* and *Laba* = *Elbe*.

Uckermark.—Here dwelt, at the end of the tenth century, the Slavonic *Ucri* or *Wucri*.

Interior of Mecklenburg and Mittelmark.—The country between the Hevel and the Muritz-See, a vast wood, requiring five days to traverse it, was the land of the Slavonic *Murizzi* or *Morizani*; westwards of these, and extending as far as the Elbe, were the *Warnabi*—Slavonic also.

Brandenburg.—Brandenburg is more than sufficiently covered by Slavonic tribes; since, the Hevelli or Slavonians of the Hevel, the Stoderani, the Brizani, the Linones, the Smeldingi, the Dossani, and the Bethenici, although the exact localities have yet to be investigated, are quite enough to fill the tract between Slavonic Altmark on the north-west, and—

Lusatia on the south-east; Lusatia, which is, at the present moment, Semi-Slavonic, and which was originally wholly so, Lower Lusatia being the country of the Milcieni, Upper Lusatia of the Lusici.

Silesia.—Now, and from the dawn of the historical period, Silesia has been in the same category with Lusatia—*i.e.*, essentially Slavonic.

The Slavonians of Lusatia and Silesia formerly extended

as far into the present country of Germany as the river Werra, and as the head-waters of the Maine.

Bohemia with parts of Moravia and Upper Hungary.—These countries have never been known to be more German than at present, and at present they are Slavonic. At the same time, I believe that there are traditions among the present Tshekhs, which refer to their conquest of the country and the usurpation of their ancestors. The value of these depends upon their nationality. This may be absolute. It may, on the other hand, be of the same value as the traditions about *Brut* being the patriarch of the Britons, or, in other words, the legend may be more due to the influence of a medieval Latin literature, than the truly native traditions.

Having thus enumerated the countries which were as much (or more) Slavonic a thousand years ago as they are now, I subjoin some of the chief extracts that prove their having been so—all of them being taken from Zeuss, and those only being selected which the date accompanies, and where there is, besides this, the special statement that the population in question was Slavonic.

The latest notices come first. They are chiefly from Adam of Bremen and Helmoldus, and apply to the Slavonians of the northern frontier.

The twelfth and eleventh centuries.—For the parts on the Lower Elbe and Oder.—The most important of the notices here apply to the Isle of Rugen, and bear, amongst other questions, upon the note in v. *Rugii*:—"Insula contra Wilzos posita, quam *Rani* vel *Runi* possident, fortissima Slavorum gens, extra quorum sententiam de publicis rebus nihil agi lex est, ita illi metuuntur propter familiaritatem deorum, vel potius dæmonum, quos majori cultu ceteris venerantur."—Ad. Brem. de situ Dan. c. 226. "Supervenit exercitus *Rugianorum* sive *Ranorum*. . . Sunt autem *Rani*, qui ab aliis *Runi* appellantur, populi crudeles, habitantes in corde maris, idololatriæ supra modum dediti, *primatum præferentes in omni Slavorum natione*, habentes regem et fanum celeberrimum. Unde etiam propter specialem fani illius cultum *primum venerationis locum obtinent*, et cum multis jugum imponant, ipsi nullius jugum patiuntur, eo quod inaccessibiles sint propter difficultatem

locorum."—Helm. iv. 36. "De omnibus quoque provinciis Slavorum illic responsa petuntur et sacrificiorum exhibentur annuæ solutiones.—c. 6. "Etiam nostra adhuc ætate non solum Wagirensis terra, sed et omnes Slavorum provinciæ illuc tributa annuatim transmittebant, illum (Zuantevit) Deum Deorum esse profitentes."—Id. ii. 42.

For the Slaves of the continent the following extracts give us the occupants of the Lower Oder,—"Oddora vergens in boream per medios Winulorum transit populos."—Adam Bremens. Hist. Eccl. c. 66. "Ultra Leuticos, qui alio nomine Wilzi dicuntur, Oddora flumen occurrit."—Ibid. "Cum multi sunt Winulorum populi fortitudine celebres, soli quatuor sunt, qui ab illis *Wilzi*, a nobis vero Leuticii dicuntur, inter quos de nobilitate potentiaque contenditur. Hi sunt scilicet *Chizzini* et *Circipani*, qui habitant citra Panim fluvium, Thosolantes et Rheteri, qui ultra Panim degunt."—Ibid. c. 140.

In the following extract from Helmoldus, mark the superlative *antiquissimam*,—"De fortitudine et potentia valida orta est contentio. Siquidem *Riaduri* sive *Tholenzi* propter *antiquissimam* urbem et celeberrimum illud fanum, in quo simulacrum Radigast ostenditur, regnare volebant, adscribentes sibi singularem nobilitatis honorem, eo quod ab omnibus populis Slavorum frequentarentur, propter responsa et annuas sacrificiorum impensiones. Porro *Circipani* atque *Kycini* servire detrectabant, imo libertatem suam armis defendere statuerunt."—Helm. iv. 21.

More satisfactory, however, than the accumulation of isolated passages is the following general view,—"Populi igitur Slavorum sunt multi, quorum primi ab occidente confines Transalbianis sunt *Waigri* (al. *Vagri*), eorum civitas Aldenburg maritima. Deinde sequuntur *Obodriti*, qui altero nomine *Reregi* vocantur, et civitas eorum Magnopolis. Item versus nos *Polabingi*, quorum civitas Racisburg. Ultra quos *Lingones* [Linones] sunt et *Warnahi*. Mox habitant *Chizzini* et *Circipani*, quos a *Tholosantibus* et *Retharis* fluvius Panis separat, et civitas Dimine. Ibi est terminus Hammaburgensis parochiæ. Sunt et alii Slavorum populi, qui inter Albiam et Odderam degunt, sicut *Heveldi*, qui juxta Haliolam [Habolam] fluvium, et *Doxani*, *Liubuzzi*, *Wilini* et *Stoderani*

cum multis aliis. Inter quos medii et potentissimi omnium sunt *Retharii*, civitas eorum vulgatissima Rethre, sedes idololatriæ."—Ad. Brem. c. 64.

The ninth century.—Earlier than Adam of Bremen, the notices are fragmentary. However, "A.D. 808. Filius imperatoris Karlus Albiam ponte junxit, et exercitum cui præerat in *Linones* et *Smeldingos* . . . transposuit."—Annal. Egenh. ad annum.—Pertz i. 195. To which add, as proof of the *Linones* being Slavonic,—"Sclavi illi dicti sunt *Lini* sive *Linoges*."—Helmold. i. 37. With the Linones, the Smeldingi and Bethenici are generally associated, and never once considered as other than Slavonic; though, at the same time, Smeld-*ing* is a German form.

The eighth century. For the parts on the Upper Elbe and Saale.—"A.D. 782. Sorabi Sclavi, qui campos inter Albim et Salam interjacentes incolunt in fines Thuringorum et Saxonum qui erant eis contermini, prædandi causâ ingressi."—Annal. Einh. ad an. Pertz i. 163.

In the seventh century.—"A.D. 623. Anno XL. regni Chlotharii homo quidam, nomine Samo, natione Francus de pago Sennonago, plures secum negotiantes adscivit, ad exercendum negotium in *Sclavos* cognomento *Winidas* perrexit."—Fredegar, c. 48.

The continuation of Samo's history shows that the *Vinidæ* here named were the *Wends* of Bohemia, at least, if not of Bohemia, of the parts still more *west*,—"Multis posthæc vicibus *Winidi* in *Thoringiam* et reliquos vastando pagos in Francorum regnum irruunt. Etiam et Dervanus dux gentis Urbiorum (Surbiorum) qui ex genere Slavonorum erant, et ad regnum Francorum jam olim adspexerant, se ad regnum Samoni cum suis tradidit."—Fredegar, c. 68.

The evidence that there were Slavonians on the Saale in the reign of Dagobert is abundant.—

"Anno X. regni Dagoberti cum ei nuntiatum fuisset exercitum Winidorum Thoringiam fuisse ingressum."—c. 74.

"Anno XI. regni Dagoberti cum Winidi jussu Samonis fortiter sævirent, et sæpe transcenso eorum limite regnum Francorum vastandum Thoringiam et reliquos pagos ingredirentur."—75.

Three other extracts bearing on the early distribution of the Slavonic nations are of sufficient importance to have particular prominence given to them.

1. The Münich library contains a MS. of the eleventh century, written in the monastery of St. Emmeram, in Bavaria, from which the following is an extract. It may conveniently be called either the St. Emmeram MS., or the Descriptio Civitatum.

"*Descriptio civitatum et regionum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii.* Isti sunt qui propinquiores resident finibus Danaorum quos vocant Nortabtrezi, ubi regio in qua sunt civitates LIII., per duces suos partitæ. Uuilci, in qua civitates XCV., et regiones IIII. Linaa, est populus qui habet civitates VII. Prope illis resident quos vocant Bethenici, et Smeldingon, et Morizani, qui habent civitates XI. Juxta illos sunt qui vocantur Hehfeldi, qui habent civitates VIII. Juxta illos regio quæ vocatur Surbi, in qua regione plures sunt quæ habent civitates L. Juxta illos sunt quos vocant Talaminzi, qui habent civitates XIIII. Beheimare, in qua sunt civitates XV. Marharii, habent civitates XI. Uulgarii, regio est immensa et populus multus habens civitates V., eo quod multitudo magna ex eis sit [vaga?] et non sit eis opus civitates habere. Est populus quem vocant Merehanos, ipsi habent civitates XXX. Istæ sunt regiones quæ terminant in finibus nostris.

"Isti sunt qui juxta istorum fines resident. Osterabtrezi, in qua civitates plusquam C. sunt. Miloxi, in qua civitates LXVII. Phesnuzi, habent civitates LXX. Thadesi, plusquam CC. urbes habent. Glopeani, in qua civitates CCCC. aut eo amplius. Zuireani, habent civitates CCCXXV. Busani, habent civitates CCXXXI. Sittici, regio immensa populis et urbibus munitissimis. Stadici, in qua civitates DXVI., populusque infinitus. Sebbirozi, habent civitates XC. Unlizi, populus multus, civitates CCCXVIII. Neriuani, habent civitates LXXVIII. Attorozi, habent CXLVIII., populus ferocissimus. Eptaradici, habent civitates CCLXIII. Uuillerozi, habent civitates CLXXX. Zabrozi, habent civitates CCXII. Znetalici, habent civitates LXXIIII. Aturezani, habent civitates CIIII. Chozirozi, habent civitates CCL. Lendizi, habent civitates XCVIII. Thafnezi, habent civitates CCLVII. Zeriuani, quod

tantum est regnum ut ex eo cunctæ gentes Sclauorum exortæ sint et originem sicut affirmant ducant. Prissani, civitates LXX. Uelunzani, civitates LXX. Bruzi, plus est undique, quam de Enisa ad Rhenum. Uuizunbeire, Caziri, civitates C.

"Ruzzi. Forsderen liudi. Fresiti. Serauici. Lucolane. Ungare. Uuislane. Sleenzane, civitates XV. Lunsizi, civitates XXX. Dadosesani, civitates XX. Milzane, civitates XXX. Besunzane, civitates II. Uerizane, civitates X. Fraganeo, civitates XL. Lupiglaa, civitates XXX. Opolini, civitates XX. Golensizi, civitates V."

2. Nearly contemporary with this is the account of the oldest Russian chronicler, and the father of Slavonic history,—Nestor, a monk of Kiov, in the beginning of the twelfth century. The names are given in the Slavonic forms for the sake of showing the frequency of the termination *-ne*; and the reader's attention is also directed to the extent to which the Scriptural view of the general dispersion of mankind is connected with the particular history of the Slavonians—"Of these seventy-two populations, the Slovenian was one; also from the families of Japhet, named Illyrian (Ilurici), which are Slovenian (*Slow-jene*).

"And after many years the Slovenians settled on the Danube, where now the Ungarian (Ugor'skaja) and Bulgarian lands (Ugor'skaja—Bolgar'skaja Zemlja) are. From these Slovenians the race spread itself over the earth, and they gave their names in the places where they settled. So their posterity, which settled on the river Morawa, named themselves Moravians (Morava), and others Tshekhs (Czesi); and such are these Slovenians, the white Croatians (Chorwati Vjelii), the Serbs (Serb') as the Carinthians (Charunt-ane).

"When the Vallachians (Voloch) made an inroad on the Slovenians of the Danube, and conquered them, and constrained them, the Slovenians went forth, and settled on the Vistula (Visłje), and called themselves Lekhs (Ljachove). And some of these people were named Poles (Pol-jane), and others Lekhs, others Lusatians (Luticzi) others Masovians (Mazovszane), others Pomoranians (Po-mor-jane).

"Thus came those Slovenians who settled on the Dnieper, and were called Poles. Others were called Derevlians (Dere-

wljane), because they settled in the woods. Others settled between the Dwina, and Prepecz, and called themselves Dregovitshians (Dregoviczi). Others, too, fixed themselves on the Dwina, and became called Polotshians (Polocz-ane), from the name of a river which flows into the Dwina.

"Other Slovenians, descendants of those on the Danube, settled on Lake Ilmin (jezero Ilmena), and kept their name, and built a city, and named it Novogorod. And others settled on the Desna, and on the Sem, and on the Suna, and called themselves Severians (Sjevera).

"And so the Slovenian tongue spread itself abroad, from which came the Slovenian writing."—This is from Zeuss, translation, pp. 597—599.

3. Earlier than either of these, though less full, is the following passage from Alfred's Orosius.*

"Be norðan Eald-Seaxum is Apdrede, and east norð is Vylte, the man Aefeldan hæt, and be eastan him is Vineda land, the man hæt *Syssyle*,† and east suð ofer summe dæl Maroaro, and hi Maroaro habbað be vestan him Thyringas, and Behemas, and Bægðvare healfe, and be suðan him on oðre healfe Donua thære ea is thæt land Carendre. Suð oð tha beorgas, the man Alpis hæt, to thæm ilcan beorgan licgað Bægðvara land gemære, and Svæfa, and thonne be eastan Carendran lande, begeondan thæm vestenne, is Pulgara land, and be eastan thæm is Creca land, and be eastan Maroaro lande is Visle land, and be eastan thæm sind Datia, tha the in væron Gottan. Be norðan eastan Maroara sindon Dalamensan, and be eastan Dalamensam sindon Horithi, and be norðan Dalamensam sindon Surpe, and be vestan him sindon Sysele. Be norðan Horiti is Mægðaland, and be norðan Mægðaland is Sermende oð tha beorgas Riffin."

* For the translation of this, see Appendix I.

† The italics mean that the word will be noticed in the *Epilegomena*.

§ VIII. ON THE ASSUMPTIONS NECESSARY TO RECONCILE THE USUAL INTERPRETATIONS OF TACITUS WITH THE STATE OF THINGS IN THE SEVENTH, EIGHTH, NINTH, TENTH, AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES.

It cannot be denied that the contrast between the evidence of Tacitus, who wrote from what he *heard* in the second, and the evidence of the authors of the time of Charlemagne, who wrote from what they *knew*, in the ninth, is remarkable. What are we to say?

1. That the evidence of Tacitus must be impugned.

2. That the evidence of Tacitus must be limited.

3. Or, that a vast system of migrations and displacements must be assumed, in order to reconcile the first accurately known state of things with the testimony of a writer whom we are unwilling to take exceptions to?

Whichever of these views be adopted, our decision ought to be made after a very careful and mature deliberation. There are complications on both sides, and the whole question is a balance of conflicting difficulties.

The occupation of the tract of country between the Vistula and the Elbe in the tenth century by Slavonians is *primâ facie* evidence of a similar occupancy in the *second*.

The term *Germania*, applied to the same by Tacitus, is *primâ facie* evidence the other way. To decide in favour of a Slavonic population on the strength of the former fact, irrespective of the conflicting testimony of Tacitus, is illegitimate; but it is equally so to take that testimony without doubt, qualification, or scrutiny. To place evidence opposed to the *a priori* probabilities upon the same level with evidence supported by them is unscientific in the extreme; indeed the writer who does it places all evidence on the same level, and requires the same amount of testimony for probabilities and improbabilities, for the barely possible and for the morally certain.

Of all the populations east of the Elbe which Tacitus, in the second century, called *German*, no single vestige appears in the tenth. How is this? Was the original statement

erroneous, or has subsequent change taken place? No general answer can be given to the question. It depends upon the credibility of the author on the one side, and the likelihood of the changes assumed, on the other. If the changes are probable and the author unexceptionable, the decision is in favour of the change. If the author, however, be exceptionable and the changes such as have never been previously known, the converse is the case. Between these extremes there is every intermediate degree. The changes may be of average magnitude, and the author of medium credibility. All this, however, merely shows that the balance between the conflicting difficulties is easily struck in some cases, that in some it is difficult, and in others almost impossible.

I am not, just at present, prepared to decide upon the particular case in hand, or to determine whether Tacitus has been, at one and the same time, accurate in all his statements, and rightly interpreted by his commentators, or whether he has not confounded Slavonians and Lithuanians with Germans. This will come in due time; at present it is sufficient to take an exception against the uncritical spirit in which his evidence has been treated. Two distinctions of paramount importance have been neglected.

1. The *extent* to which his statements are at variance with the first *known state of things* subsequent to his time, has been overlooked.

2. The value of his evidence for the parts which could only be known, to even his best informants, by hearsay only, has been placed on the same level with the value of his evidence respecting the parts personally known to his contemporaries.

How different, for instance, were his means of describing a Frisian or a Cheruscan, from his *data* for Poland and Silesia. Yet Poland and Silesia are parts of the *Germania* of Tacitus, and Friesland and Osnaburg are no more. The legionary of Drusus or Tiberius might describe, from personal knowledge, the populations of Ems, or Weser; but, whoever described the tribes of the Oder or Vistula, would describe them from hearsay accounts,—hearsay accounts, which I have no wish to undervalue,—hearsay accounts which can often be satisfac-

torily confirmed,—hearsay accounts, however, which have just the same relation to the descriptions of the parts visited by the Roman armies, as the *data* for the geography of Central Africa have to the surveys of the colonies of Natal, the Cape, or Angola.

This leads us to a new series of preliminary points of criticism.

A certain amount of migration and displacement is necessary. If Germans were the original occupants of the parts in question, the Slavonians must have superseded them in it.

The likelihood or unlikelihood of this must be tested in several ways.

First, in respect to its *extent.*—The assumed migration must have been unsurpassed, perhaps unequally, by any other within the historical period. When the Germans of Charlemagne, and his successors, conquered (or re-conquered) Transalbian Germany, there was neither trace nor record of any previous Germanic occupancy. Yet such previous occupancy rarely occurs without leaving signs of its existence. Sometimes there are fragments of the primitive population safe in the protecting fastnesses of some mountain, forest, or fen, whose savage independence testifies their original claim on the soil. In this way the Welsh of Wales, and the Basques of the Pyrenees, are monuments of that aboriginal population which held possession of Spain and Britain, long before the beginning of history, and which partially holds possession of them now. Yet there is no want of natural strongholds in the country in question. The Saxon Switzerland, the Bohemian range, the forests of Lithuania might well have been to the Germans of Tacitus, what Snowdon was to the Britons of Agricola, or the Pyrenees to the old Iberians; in which case the *present* Germans of those countries would be the oldest inhabitants of them,—not the newest, as they are.

Another way in which a primitive, but displaced population escapes annihilation, is, by taking upon itself the character of a servile population. In this way the Helots of Sparta, represent the older inhabitants of Laconia, as well as the conquered Messenians. Upon this principle Niebuhr argues

that the circumstance of certain Greek towns of Southern Italy, calling their slaves *Pelasgi*, indicates a previous Pelasgic population. By a not illegitimate extension of this view, the existence of the system of *castes* is supposed to betoken a duality of race,—the conquered and the conquerors. But a servile class of conquered aborigines, was as much wanting in the Slavonian portions of the *Germania*, when it was first known otherwise than by hearsay, as the analogues of the Welsh or Biscayans. The signs of a primitive population, shown as they show themselves in Britain or Spain; shown as they showed themselves in Greece or Italy; or shown as they showed themselves in Hindostan, were equally non-existent.

Neither were there any *traditions*. No lays celebrated either the Arthur which defended, or the Ida which ravaged the soil. The supposed conquerors knew of no *indigenæ* which they replaced. No *indigenæ* complained of the stranger who dispossessed them.

Lastly, *Saxon* as is England, the oldest geographical terms are *Keltic*; some of the original names of the rivers and mountains remaining unchanged. The converse is the case in Transalbingian Germany. The older the name the more surely is it Slavonic.

So much for the extent of the assumed displacement. It must have been the greatest and the most absolute of any recorded in history.

It must also have taken place with unparalleled rapidity. By supposing that the assumed changes set in immediately after the time of Tacitus, and that as soon as that writer had recorded the fact that Poland, Bohemia, and Courland were parts of *Germania*, the transformation of these previously Teutonic areas into Slavonic ones, began, we have a condition as favourable for a great amount of changes as can fairly be demanded. Still it may be improved. The last traces of the older population may be supposed to have died out only just before the time when the different areas became known as exclusively Slavonic; an assumption which allows the advocate of the German theory to say that, had our information been a little earlier, we should have found what we

want in the way of vestiges, fragments, and effects of the antecedent non-Slavonic aborigines. Be it so. Still the time is short. Bohemia—as we have seen—appears as an exclusively Slavonic country as early as A.D. 625. Is the differences between these areas and the time of Tacitus sufficient?

Undoubtedly a great deal in the way of migration and displacement may be done in five hundred years, and still more in seven hundred; yet it may be safely said that, under no circumstances whatever, within the historical period, has any known migration equalled the rapidity and magnitude of the one assumed, and that under no circumstances has the obliteration of all signs of an earlier population been so complete.

How could the displacement inferred from this utter obliteration, have taken place? Was it by a process of ejection, so that the presumed immigrant *Slavonians* conquered and expelled the original *Goths?* The chances of war, when we get to the historical period, run the other way; and the first fact which we know concerning those self-same Slavonians, who are supposed to have dispossessed the Germans in the third and fourth centuries, is that, in the ninth, the Germans dispossessed them. But, perhaps, the Germans were more warlike in the time of Charlemagne than before. Not so; witness the names of Alaric, Euric, Theodoric, Clovis, &c.

If this view will not suffice, let us try another. Let us ask if it may not be the case, that, when those Germans, who are admitted to have left their country in great numbers, migrated southwards, they left vast gaps in the population of their original areas, which the Slavonians from behind filled up, even by the force of pressure; since geography abhors a *vacuum* as much as nature is said to do.

I will not say that this view is wholly unsupported by induction. Something of the kind may be found amongst the Indians of North America, where a hunting-ground abandoned by one tribe is appropriated by another. The magnitude, however, of such vacuities is trifling compared with the one in question; besides which, the Indian migrations are those of a pastoral people, who take their wives and children with

them, and, consequently, leave behind them no means of preserving traces of their previous existence.

History only tells us of German *armies* having advanced southwards. The conversion of these *armies* into *national migrations* is gratuitous.

But if the area of the *dispossessed* Germans was thus remarkable, that of those who held their ground was not less so.

Along the Danube there was, at the time of Tacitus, a real existence of Germans to the south of Bohemia and Moravia, and it extended so far eastwards as to come within the same degree of longitude as the supposed Goths of the Baltic. The Germans of the Danube were the Marcomanni; perhaps the Quadi; and almost certainly, some of the ancestors and vaunt-couriers of the Goths of Mœsia in the third century.

Now these kept their ground, being the only ones that are admitted to have done so. They did more; they encroached permanently on their neighbours to the east. Strange, that the fact of lying south of a given degree of latitude, should thus have preserved those Germans of the Danube against those fierce Slavonians who (if we suppose the Lygii to have been Germans, and the Marcomanni to have occupied all Bohemia) so thoroughly exterminated their brethren to the north. It looks as if the fact of their having been personally engaged in warfare against Rome, had so sharpened their swords as to have endowed them with powers of resistance unknown north of the Bohemian frontier. Everywhere else the Germans retired; between Bohemia and the Danube they encroached.

Yet it was not for want of enemies that they thus kept their ground. Theirs was no locality especially favoured by peace. They had the same Slavonians to contend with that extinguished the supposed Germans of the Oder and Vistula, and they had the Romans as well. It is not strange that the ancestors of the Ostrogoths and Visigoths should have held out against these odds. It is strange that they should have been the only Germans who did so. Surely this is a page in history which may be read differently; and instead of

supposing them to have been thus exceptional to their countrymen, they may be considered as the only Germans of whose existence in the time of Tacitus we are sure.

It was as little for the want of actual wars and migrations as for the paucity of hostile neighbours, that these exceptional Germans of the Danube are found, in the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, in the locality assigned to them by Tacitus in the second.

There was much of each. This we *know* to have been the case. Of similar wars and similar migrations, on the Oder and Vistula, we know nothing; we only assume them for the sake of accounting for a supposed change of population.

Now it is certainly unscientific to attribute so much, in the way of displacement, to the wars and migrations of which we know nothing, when those which we do know are known to have done but little. On the real theatre of action, the Middle Danube, what is it that we find in the time of Tacitus? Romans, Germans, Slavonians, all on the Rhætian and Pannonian frontier, the Romans having the lion's share of country. What in the time of Theodoric? Germans, Romans, and Slavonians, the Germans possessing much of what the Romans had lost. This is what we see on the points illuminated by the clear light of history; and the changes implied are but *moderate*. In the parts beyond, however, everything increases its dimensions. The wars are more exterminating, and the migrations longer, the displacements greater than anything known elsewhere. Is this the view which we get from that cautious induction which measures the unknown by the known, or is it a mere sketch of the imagination, where all things show larger in the twilight, and where anything may be assumed, because, though there is nothing to support an hypothesis, there is nothing to contradict it?

Necdum finitus Orestes.—The list of improbabilities against the doctrine of the double migration, are named legion. The inroad which so obliterated the eastern Germans of the Germania of Tacitus, was not exclusively Slavonic; it was Lithuanic as well. Neither was the whole area which, in

the ninth century, was undoubtedly divided between these Lithuanians and Slavonians, *absolutely* German even in the eyes of Tacitus. At the mouth of the Vistula the *Æstyii* spoke a language like the *British*.

Let these Æstyians, on the strength of their *sermo Britannicæ propior*, be called the *non*-Germanic portion of the so-called original Germanic area; and—

Let the *Prussians*, on the strength of their Lithuanic tongue, be called the *non*-Slavonic portion of the same area as it appears in the 12th century.

It will be found that the relation of the *non*-Slavonic portion of the Slavonian period, was exactly that of the *non*-Germanic portion during the Germanic period—*i.e.*, both the Æstyians and Prussians occupied the same locality.

Hence, the displacement of these *Britanno-Germanic* populations (and the statement of Tacitus is as valid for the *Æstyians* speaking a language like the British as for any single fact connected with these parts) must have been accompanied with a remarkable act of discrimination—since the parts occupied by the populations like the *British* became *Lithuanic* and not Slavonic, the remainder *Slavonic* and not *Lithuanic*. This nice appropriation of different parts of the different areas cannot be said to add to the probability of the migration which must be assumed. Such a migration, annihilating the population, traditions, and local names, and all the substantial realities of a vast district, and, yet, preserving the *form* of its ethnological area, is, to say the least, a very remarkable one; since it gives us a phenomenon which is better ascertained in chemistry than in history, *i.e.*, *the phenomenon of replacement and substitution.*

A further consideration of the probabilities herein involved will be found in the notes on the word *Æstyii.*

But it may be urged that the language of Tacitus respecting the *lingua Britannicæ propior* must not be taken too closely? Granted. But what statement is more explicit. If we doubt or qualify this, why not doubt or qualify much more; *e.g.*, the Germanic position of the Lygii. This is what should be done. All that is required is consistency.

But strange as is the accident, that the Prussian conquest should

exactly coincide with the area of the British language, it is not an isolated instance.

In the time of Tacitus the parts between Moravia, Gallicia, and Hungary were occupied by nations speaking *three* different languages—the German, the *Pannonica lingua* of Tacitus, and the *Gallica lingua* of Tacitus.

At the *present* time *three* tongues meet in the same parts —the German, the Slovak, and the Polish of Gallicia, the Majiar of Hungary being a fourth; but that is of late introduction.

Now if we assume much migration for these parts, the migration must have been of the peculiar kind just indicated, a chemical migration, so to say, a migration *plus* substitution and replacement; a migration which, whatever it did in the way of an indiscriminate abolition of all nationality, at least left the boundaries of three different languages, and their geographical relations to each other, much as it found them.

Certain writers, however (as already stated), adopt the view of a German migration from the parts between the Elbe and Vistula sufficiently exhaustive of the original population to leave the country in a state of emptiness for the Slavonians of the parts farther eastwards to fill up. These, as they borrow their notion of a *vacuum* from the science of physics, may take their theory of replacement and substitution from the chemist. *Valeat quantum.*

Such the displacement. Whence came those who effected it? Not from the country east of the Guttones. There were no such Slavonians *there*. East of the Guttones (the supposed frontier people of Germany), the populations were wholly either Lithuanic or Finnic until the last few centuries, and are nearly so now. This, then, is no birthplace for the Slavonians of Mecklenburg and Pomerania.

Did they come from the south—*i.e.*, from Bohemia? No! Bohemia, according to the hypothesis, was German, besides which, their language was, probably, less like the Bohemian than the Polish.

Then they came from Poland? Not even this. Poland was occupied by Lygian Germans.

They can be brought from no point nearer than the water-system of the Dnieper. Yet the water-system of the Dnieper will not give us the phenomenon required. The language of that river is eminently homogeneous (Russian); whilst the languages of Saxony, Silesia, Bohemia, Poland, Pomerania, and Brandenburg, although all Slavonic, are spoken in numerous dialects and sub-dialects. To derive all this from the Dnieper is to deduce the whole from the part, the old from the new.

We have now taken a measure of some of the improbabilities involved in the doctrine of a Slavonic migration to the Transalbian portion of the *Germania*, between the times of Tacitus and Charlemagne; and though they are undeniably great, their magnitude is only relative; and a certain degree of evidence may overbalance them. Difficult as it is to believe that Poland was ever Germanic, there is, nevertheless, an amount of testimony which would make it credible. Had an observer like Cæsar visited the country *in person*, and known it as well as he knew Gaul, his *dictum* would, probably, have outweighed all other difficulties. On the other hand, had a writer of no character whatever classed it amongst the countries of Germany, I should have troubled the reader with but few reasons for objecting to him, and have disposed of his evidence in a summary manner, by treating his statement as an error.

The authority of Tacitus is intermediate to these two extremes.

Implicit and uncritical belief is not always the highest tribute of respect. So far from finding any morbid feeling of pleasure in taking exceptions to the statements of a great writer like Tacitus, I have no hesitation in saying, that the more I have criticised the more I have found to admire. So numerous are the cases where an unscrutinizing adoption of his statements only mystifies us! Whereas the admission of the slightest amount of fallibility gives us an important fact. Such, amongst others, is the statement concerning the language of the Æstyii, and of the Gothini (vid. *nott.* in *vv.*)

More than this, the very latitude given to the term *Germania*, though wrong as far as the facts which it implies are con-

cerned, is scientifically correct. What Tacitus *knew* of the Germans of the south was, that they extended as far down the Danube as the frontier of Pannonia (say, the parts about Pesth); and he had no reason to imagine that their southern extension went one hair's-breadth further in an easterly direction than did their northern one; or *vice versâ*. Hence, the extension of their area, as far along the Baltic as it was known to reach along the Danube, was legitimate: subject, of course, to correction from further investigation; and equally legitimate was the assumption that the Ligii and other populations of the intervening parts were German—since the reasoning ran thus—

a. The *southern* Germans run thus far eastwards.

b. The *northern* do the same.

c. So do the parts interjacent. Subject, I say, to correction from absolute investigation this *a priori* view was strictly scientific; and who shall say that Tacitus put it forth unconditionally?

Again—had the Baltic been even less German than it actually was, it was only through Germans that it was known to the Greeks and Romans: what, then, was more natural than that the extent of the German sea-board upon it should be over-valued? Like the present Danes with their occupancy of the Sound, their prominence exceeded their occupancy.

These and similar considerations show that such inaccuracies as we find in Tacitus are, so far from subtracting from his value as an authority, or from the respect due to his testimony, that they enhance his credit. Such as occur could hardly have been avoided; and the only wonder is that there are so few of them.

If, however, we deny this reasonable amount of inaccuracy, the thoroughly hypothetical character of the migrations in question cannot be too strongly stated, or too prominently exhibited. They are referable to one head, and to one head only, *viz.*, the facts which they will explain. In and of themselves they are wholly unsupported—unsupported without, however, lying beyond the pale of observation. The countries to which they appertain were known (at least) well enough for Tacitus and others to write about. The

Germans had their *ancient songs* that served as records. And what event so important as the previous loss and subsequent re-conquest of two-thirds of their indigenous soil?

In short, the migrations in question must come under the following conditions:—

a. They must be of unparalleled magnitude and completeness—

b. Of unparalleled rapidity—

c. Unrecorded in any history—

d. Unrepresented by any tradition—

e. Accompanied by the strange phenomenon of replacement and substitution; and—

f. Effected by improbable agents.*

§ IX. ETHNOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF THE REMAINING EUROPEAN POPULATIONS.

The third chapter has served to illustrate the principles of ethnological classification; since it has shown that nations as different as the Icelander and the Swiss may be comprized in one general division; in other words that a *stock* comprises populations as different from each other as the Bavarians, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Faroe Islanders and the Americans of the United States. Hence the Gothic stock is *one* of the stocks of which we have a pretty clear idea.

Another such a stock is the *Classical.* This comprises the Latins and Greeks—ancient and modern. Besides which it, to a certain extent, comprises the Spaniards, the Portuguese, the French, certain Swiss populations, and the Wallachians; in all of which countries the language is derived from the Latin; the population being mixed, *i.e.*, partly consisting of Roman, partly of aboriginal blood. Now, recognising the great Classical stock as an ethnological equivalent to the Gothic, and comparing the extent to which a Wallachian differs from an Italian or a modern Greek of the other, we have a convenient measure of the import of the word *stock*; since we see the amount of difference implied by it.

* *Viz.* by that division of the European populations which, within the historical period, has *retreated* before the Germanic rather than encroached on it.

Besides the Classical and Gothic, there are five other stocks in Europe; or, changing the expression, the whole *indigenous* population of Europe may be thrown into seven groups. Three of these have already been mentioned—the Gothic, the Sarmatian, the Classical.

The *fourth*, the *Keltic*, comprises the ancient Gauls of Gallia, and the ancient Britons of England, as well as the present Bretons of Brittany, Welsh of Wales, Manxmen of the Isle of Man, and Gaels of Ireland and Scotland.

The Ugrians, or Finns, make the *fifth* group; and a large group it is. Besides which it is the only one common to Europe and Asia. Lapland, Finland, Esthonia, and Hungary, are the present Finn or Ugrian areas in Europe. In Hungary, however, the Finn population is of recent introduction, the present Ugrian *indigenæ* being the Lapps, Finlanders, and Esthonians.

The Basques of the Pyrenees, the only remnants of the old Iberian population of Spain, form the *sixth* stock.

The Albanians of Albania the *seventh*.

The Turks of Turkey, and the Maltese, are not enumerated; not being indigenous.

§ X. VALUATION OF ETHNOLOGICAL GROUPS BY THE WRITERS OF ANTIQUITY.

It is not enough to know how a *modern* writer classifies the varieties of his species. The reader of Tacitus must try to ascertain the view that the *ancients* took of them. We must not be surprised to find it less scientific than our own.

Of the *Classical* stock they had a clear notion; *i.e.*, they put at its full value the differences between the group to which they themselves belonged, and the groups to which the so-called *Barbarians* belonged. But this notion was clear in one direction only. It only comprehended the points of difference. The resemblances which brought the Slavonians and Goths into the same group with themselves—the group called Indo-European—were unknown.

Between a Goth, a Kelt, and a Sarmatian, in their more extreme forms, they also drew a clear distinction; although

their way of denoting it was less precise than our own, and not always expressed in the same terms.

Of the Ugrians they knew little. Nevertheless, Tacitus and others distinguish between the Finns and the Germans.

The Albanians, I think, were distinguished from the Greeks *clearly;* but from the nations on their northern frontier indistinctly. The term *Illyrian* comprises the *Albanians, and something more.*

The Iberians were clearly distinguished from all other stocks but the Keltic—from that indistinctly.

Upon the whole, the ancients may be said to have *over*valued the difference between themselves and the other six stocks, and to have *under*valued the difference between the other groups of Europe; and this is just what the Spaniards and English did and do with the present American aborigines.

These observations have been made upon the assumption that the only point which required illustration was the extent to which the ancients and moderns differed in their views of the *same phenomena;* an assumption which supposes that the number of stocks at the beginning of the historical period was neither more nor less than it is at present, and that their mutual relations were the same. This, however, may not have been the case. Stocks may have become extinct; or, instead of the broad and trenchant lines of demarcation which now separate the great groups from each other, there may have been a series of imperceptible transitions. In either of these cases it would be incorrect to say that the modern view is more scientific than the ancient. The latter, instead of seeing the same things in a different light, may have seen a different state of things.

§ XI. ON CERTAIN ISOLATED MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN FAMILY —REAL OR SUPPOSED.

The connexion of the American with the Englishman is clear. Nearly as clear is that between the Englishman and the German. In either case there has been a continuous extension of the original population; and that within the period of clear and authentic history.

But what if we found Englishmen in countries which no Englishman was known to have invaded? isolated Englishmen? Englishmen cut off from the rest of their nation and language? In this case we should have a truly ethnological fact; since *history*, properly so called, would be silent.

Or what if we found apart from the other *Germans*, similarly isolated populations, whose language was indeed German, but of an uncertain affinity—connected with the Dutch as much as the English, the Norse as much as the Frisian.

What if the language were lost, and nothing but similarity of manners, or some vague tradition connected them with the assumed parent stock?

The problem would become still more complicated.

Now such problems really exist. There are Goths beyond the pale of England, America, Germany, and Scandinavia. They require notice.

1. *The Germans of the Vicentine.*—Two (perhaps more) passages mention the reception, on the part of Theodoric the Ostro-Goth, of certain *Alemannic Germans*, within the boundaries of Italy. One is a letter of his own to Clovis:—"Motus vestros in fessas reliquias temperate: quia jure gratiæ merentur evadere, *quos ad parentum vestrorum defensionem respicitis confugisse.* Estote illis remissi, *qui nostris finibus celantur exterriti.*"—Cassiod. Variar. ii. 41.

The other is from the Panegyric of Ennodius:—"Quid quod a te *Alamanniæ generalitas intra Italiæ terminos* sine detrimento Romanæ possessionis inclusa est? cui evenit habere regem, postquam meruit perdidisse. *Facta est Latiaris custos imperii* semper nostrorum populatione grassata. Cui

feliciter cessit fugisse patriam suam, nam sic adepta est soli nostri opulentiam."

At the present moment the *Sette communi* near Verona, and the *Tredice communi* near Vicenza, are inhabited by an isolated population, whose language is a peculiar, and insufficiently studied, dialect of the German—apparently of the High-German division. The Alemanni of the time of Theodoric are the Germans, whom this settlement is most generally supposed to represent.

2. *The Germans of the Crimea.*— Procopius mentions under the name of Γότθοι Τετραξῖται, a small Gothic population on the Palus Mæotis—'Η Μαιῶτις *καλουμένη λίμνη ἐς τὴν ἀκτὴν πόντου τοῦ Εὐξείνου τὰς ἐκβολὰς ποιεῖται . . παρὰ δὲ τὸν χῶρον αὐτὸν, ὅθεν ἡ τῆς λίμνης ἐκβολὴ ἄρχεται, Γότθοι οἱ Τετραξῖται καλούμενοι ᾤκηνται, οὐ πολλοὶ ὄντες.*—Bell. Goth. iv. 4.

He praises the bravery with which they withstood the Utuguri.*

In the following extract the Ἀβασγοί are the Circassians with whom these Goths came more in contact than any other Europeans:—*Εἴτε δὲ τῆς Ἀρείου δόξης ἐγένοντό ποτε οἱ Γότθοι οὗτοι, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα Γοτθικὰ ἔθνη, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλο τι ἀμφὶ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῖς ἤσκητο, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ ἴσασιν, ἀλλ' ἀφελείᾳ τε τανῦν καὶ ἀπραγμοσύνῃ πολλῇ τιμῶσι τὴν δόξαν. Οὗτοι ὀλίγῳ πρότερον (λέγω δὲ, ἡνίκα πρῶτόν τε καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος Ἰουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς τὴν αὐτοκράτορα εἶχεν ἀρχὴν) πρέσβεις τέτταρας ἐς Βυζάντιον ἔπεμψαν, ἐπίσκοπον σφίσι τινὰ δεόμενοι δοῦναι· ἐπεὶ ὅστις μὲν αὐτοῖς ἱερεὺς ἦν, τετελευτήκει οὐ πολλῷ πρότερον. Ἔγνωσαν δὲ ὡς καὶ Ἀβασγοῖς ἱερέα βασιλεὺς ἔπεμψε, καὶ αὐτοῖς προθυμότατα Ἰουστινιανὸς βασιλεὺς ἐπιτελῆ ποιήσας τὴν δέησιν ἀπεπέμψατο.*—Bell. Goth. iv. 4.

In the eighth century they withstand the Khazars:—*Οὗτος ὁ ὅσιος πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰωάννης ἐπίσκοπος ἦν Γοτθίας ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Λέοντος τῶν βασιλέων, ὁρμώμενος ἐκ τῆς περατικῆς τῶν Ταυροσκυθῶν γῆς, τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν χώραν τῶν Γότθων τελούσης, ἐμπορίου λεγομένου Παρθενιτῶν,*

* Probably allied to the *Huns.*

Λέοντος καὶ Φωτεινῆς υἱὸς γεγονώς . . . ὁ δὲ ὅσιος οὗτος ἐπίσκοπος Ἰωάννης μετὰ ταῦτα μετὰ τοῦ ἰδίου λαοῦ τοῖς ἄρχουσι τῶν Χαζάρων ἐξεδόθη, διὰ τὸ συσταθῆναι αὐτῷ τῷ κυρίῳ Γοτθίας, καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, πρὸς τὸ μὴ κατακυριεῦσαι τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν τοὺς εἰρημένους Χαζάρους. Ἀποστείλας γὰρ ὁ Χαγάνος παρέλαβε τὸ κάστρον αὐτῶν τὸ λεγόμενον Δορὸς, θέμενος ἐν αὐτῷ φύλακας τοξάτους, οὓς καὶ ἐξεδίωξεν ὁ εἰρημένος ὅσιος ἐπίσκοπος μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰς χλησούρας ἐκράτησεν.—Vit. S. Joannis, ex Cod. Vatic. ap. Boll. Jun. 5, 190, 191.

A.D. 1255, they spoke German:—" Il y a des grands promontoires ou caps sur cette mer depuis Kersona jusqu'aux embouchures du Tanais et environ quarante châteaux entre Kersona et Soldaia, dont chacun a sa langue particulière. Il y a aussi plusieurs *Goths, qui retiennent encore la langue Allemande.*"—Reis. Rubruquis.

So they did in 1436:—" Dritto dell' isola di Capha d' intorno, ch' è su 'l mar maggiore, si truoua la *Gothia*, e poi l' Alania, laqual và per l' isola verso Moncastro . . *Gothi parlano in Todesco.* So questo, perche havendo un famiglio Todesco con me, parlauano insieme et intendeuansi assai ragioneuolmente, cosi come s' intenderia un Furlano con un Fiorentino."—Josafa Barbaro.

A.D. 1557—1564, Busbequius describes the appearance of one of them as " procerior, toto ore ingenuam quandam simplicitatem præ se ferens, ut Flander videretur aut Batavus." He further learned—" gentem esse bellicosam, quæ complures pagos hodieque incoleret, ex quibus Tartarorum regulus, cum expediret, octingentos pedites sclopetarios scriberet, præcipuum suarum copiarum firmamentum: primarias eorum urbes alteram *Mancup* vocari, alteram *Sciuarin.*"

Finally, he gives a short vocabulary of their language.—See Legatio Turcica.

The nearest representatives of the proper Goths of the Lower Danube are these Goths of the Crimea, whose language is now said to be extinct, but who require further investigation.

The Germans of both the Vicentine and the Crimea are well authenticated, and unequivocally Germanic populations. This is not the case with—

3. *The Germans* (?) *of Carniola*.—In Zeuss we have the following extract—one from an old, the other from a modern writer:—

a. Procop. Bell. Goth. i. 15, *Ὕπερθε δὲ αὐτῶν* (Βενετίων) *Σίσκιοί τε καὶ Σουάβοι* (*οὐχ οἱ Φράγγων κατήκοοι, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τούτους ἕτεροι*) *χώραν τὴν μεσόγειον ἔχουσι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτους* Κάρνιοί *τε καὶ* Νουρικοὶ *ἵδρυνται.*

b. Lazius de Migratione Gentium: — "Quæ declarant, Justiniano adhuc imperante *Suevos* ditionem in Liburnia habuisse, interque Dravum Savumque amnes et Istriam rerum fuisse potitos. Imo adhuc nostra tempestate et reliquias et posteritatem superesse constat, etsi a Slavinis in angustias redactam, *locoque arcto ac nemoroso Gotschee conclusam*, ubi oppidulum cum paucis castris, multisque pagis manet, quorum incolæ in medio Slavinorum non solum Germanicam sonant, verum etiam Suevicam pronunciationem præferunt."—P. 363.

The name *Gotschee* is mentioned by Constantinus Porphyrogenita—*Καὶ ὁ* Βοάνος *αὐτῶν κρατεῖ τὴν* Κρίβασαν, *τὴν Λίτζαν, καὶ τὴν* Γουτζηκᾶ.—De Administ. Imp. c. 30.

The term *Gotschee* is sufficiently like *Goth* to indicate an etymology in that quarter; but upon this Zeuss remarks that, "this is no reason for so deriving it, since the form *Goduscani** admits of another etymology, *viz.*, *Gôdesca* from *gôd*, *bonus*."—"Der Name hat Anklang mit dem der Gothen, gibt aber darum noch keinen Grund zur Ableitung der Gotscheer aus diesem Volke, da die Schreibung *Goduscani* noch andere Etymologie (*Gôdisca* aus *gôd*, bonus) zulässt."—Zeuss, 591.

It is more important to verify the statement of Lazius than to speculate on it; but it is so doubtful whether this can be done, that it is only because the *Gotschee* population has been recognized by good writers as Germans, that it finds a place at all in the present volume. The following facts stand against the extract from Lazius:—

1. The absence of any other testimony to the previous existence of Goths in Carniola.

2. The absence of any traces of them at present.

* The Latin form of the word.

3. The likelihood of Procopius having meant, by Σουάβοι, the Slavonians of the river Save; whilst the similarity of the word to *Suevi* misled Lazius.

4. The conjunction of the *Gotscheer*, as *Goduscani*, with the Slavonic *Obotrites* of the Danube (so-called), and the equally Slavonic *Timociani*, in an embassy to Louis in A.D. 818, as well as in other Slavonic alliances.

§ XII. ON THE MILITARY AND OTHER COLONIES OF THE GERMANIC AND NON-GERMANIC AREAS.

The frontier between the Germanic Thuringians, and the Slavonic Sorabians, or Sorbs, at the beginning of the historical period, was the river Saale.

Yet there were Slavonian populations west of this—even on the Upper Mayne and Neckar, and in other quarters equally Germanic.

Thus—" De possessionibus S. Bonfatii martyris præscriptus venerabilis Abbas Vuerinharius pari mutuatione concambii dedit in jus et proprietatem S. Mauritii martyris quicquid in Frekenleba, et Scekkensteti, Arneri, Lembeki et Faderesrod, Kerlingorod, Mannesfeld, Duddondorf, Rodonvualli, Menstedi, Purtin et Elesleiba aliisque villis villarumque partibus quas *Slavuanicæ familiæ inhabitant* . . . visus est habere."—Docum. A.D. 973.

And, again, earlier still, in A.D. 846.—" Qualiter . . . . . domnus Karolus . . . . episcopis præcepisset, ut in terra Sclavorum, qui sedent inter Moinum et Radantiam fluvios, qui vocantur *Moinu-winidi* et *Ratanz-winidi*."

Taken by themselves, these passages suggest the notion that, great as are the limitations placed by the present writer upon the accredited Germanic area of Tacitus, they are still insufficient; in other words, that the Slavonic frontier should be brought even further westward.

Similar passages also occur in respect to the parts about the Hartz which (*taken by themselves*) lead to the same conclusion.

They must not, however, be taken by themselves. The system of military colonies, or, if not military colonies, of the

forcible removal of conquered populations, which we find to have been practised by the Kings of Persia and Assyria, was also practised by the later Roman Emperors. It was also practised by more than one Germanic conqueror — though the exact time when the system began is difficult to ascertain. A system, however, it was—"Decem millia hominum ex his, qui utrasque ripas Albis fluminis incolebant, cum uxoribus et parvulis sublatos transtulit, et huc atque illuc per Galliam et Germaniam multimoda divisione distribuit."

This is related by Eginhard of the great enemy of the Saxons—Charlemagne.

Again—"Misit imperator (Charlemagne also) scaras suas in Wimodia et in Hostingabi et in Rosogavi, ut illam gentem foras patriam transduceret; nec non et illos Saxones, qui ultra Albiam erant, transduxit foras, et divisit eos in regnum suum ubi voluit." — Chronicon Moissiac. ad an. 804. (Pertz i. 307.)

The following is a double removal:—"Æstate in Saxoniam ducto exercitu, omnes qui trans Albiam et in Wihmuodi habitabant Saxones cum mulieribus et infantibus transtulit in Franciam, et pagos transalbianos Abotridis dedit."—Annal. Einhard. ad an. 804. (Pertz i. 191.)

Lastly—"In diebus illis surrexerunt de populo *Holzatorum* amplius quam sexcentæ familiæ, transmissoque amne abierunt via longissima, quærentes sibi sedes opportunas, ubi fervorem persecutionis declinarent. Veneruntque in *montes Harticos*, et manserunt ibi, ipsi et filii et nepotes eorum usque in hodiernum diem."—Helm. Chron. Slav. i. 26.

The Frisians, Dutch, and Saxons seem to have been the chief colonists of this kind:—"Neque illæ fraudes locorum, nec . . perfugia silvarum barbaros tegere potuerunt, quominus ditioni tuæ divinitatis omnes sese dedere cogerentur, *et cum conjugiis ac liberis, ceteroque examine necessitudinum ac rerum suarum ad loca olim deserta transirent*, ut quæ fortasse ipsi quondam deprædando vastaverant, *culta redderent* serviendo: arat ergo nunc mihi *Chamavus* et *Frisius* et ille vagus, ille prædator exercitio squalidus operatur et frequentat nundinas meas pecore venali, et cultor barbarus laxat annonam."—Eumenii Panegyr. in Maxim. cc. 8, 9.

For the particular colony of the Warasci, see note in *v. Narisci*.

In the same neighbourhood (*i.e.*, on the Doubs) were several *pagi* of—

a. The *Commavi*, *Amavi*, taking as a later form, the name pagus *Ammaus*, *Emaus*, and *Amausensis*—

b. The *Athoarii*, *Attoarii*, *Hatuarii*, or *Hatoarii*.

There can be little doubt but that these were *Chamavi* and *Chattuarii* removed from their original localities.

The detail of such colonies is a point of minute ethnology. They are mentioned here, however, for the sake of showing that the presence of certain populations in certain localities, is to be taken with caution. They may exist without the parts about them being similarly occupied. In which case the population is *sporadic*.

Now, in order to constitute a true ethnological area, a population must not be isolated, unconnected, or *sporadic*, but *continuous*.

§ XIII. GERMANIC AREA OF TACITUS.

The Germany of Tacitus extends from the Rhine to the parts about the amber-country of Courland on the north, and as far as Gallicia on the south: to each of which countries we have special allusions.

For the intermediate portion of Europe, the frontier is carried at least as far as the most eastern of these points; and possibly farther—possibly farther, because the central nation of the *Lygii*, whose country coincides with the modern kingdom of Poland, is described as a large one.

With these limits it includes Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, Pomerania, East and West Prussia, Saxony, Silesia, Bohemia, and Poland.

By the *Germany* of Tacitus, I mean Tacitus according to the usual interpretation; without either affirming or denying that his text requires this extent of country to verify it.

§ XIV. CERTAIN MODERN ADDITIONS TO THE GERMANIC AREA OF TACITUS.

It by no means follows that, because the *Germania* of Tacitus constitutes a very large tract of country, the *whole* of the area occupied by the Germanic stock was therefore known to that author.

He writes that it was separated from Dacia and Sarmatia *montibus aut mutuo metu.*

This is not the language of a precise geographer—indeed, precise geography for the parts in question was in Tacitus's time an impossibility.

Hence, any writer who may hold that there was a Germany or Germans, either to the north or to the east of the limits ascribed in the *Germania*, holds nothing unreasonable. The Dacians and Sarmatians might only have *interrupted* the outline of that area; in which case Germans might re-appear on the Lower Danube, or in Western Russia, Germans of whom Tacitus knew nothing, and of whom he had lost sight on reaching the Dacian and Sarmatian frontier.

There is nothing unreasonable in all this; and the likelihood of the Germanic area of Tacitus being *smaller*, is just as open a question as the likelihood of its being *larger*, than the real one. Individually, I believe it to be too wide;* but that is no reason why others should not consider it too narrow.

This has been done. The greatest authority of Germany has expended much learning and ingenuity (language more favourable than this cannot be applied to even the arguments of the great author of the Deutsche Grammatik) on what may be called the *Getic hypothesis.*

Let it be admitted that the chances against the name of a locality reached by a body of emigrants, invaders, or conquerors, being identical with that of the locality from which those emigrants, invaders, or conquerors started, are almost infinite.

Thus, the chances are almost infinite against the *native* New Zealand name of the locality of the present settlement

* Though only in its *eastern* direction. Its *northern* area was too small.

of Canterbury, being Canterbury also. Nor yet any name very similar to it, such as *Canterberg*, *Kentbury*, &c.

Though this is an extreme case, it illustrates the points of question—it being assumed, of course, that the similarity is wholly accidental. If Englishmen had been there previously, the case would be different. The similarity would then be other than accidental; and a connexion of some sort or other between the district in which the settlement took place, and the district from which the settlers originated would account for it.

No one imagines Boston in Massachusets to be a native Indian name. Yet why should it not be so? Not because the combination was either impossible or improbable for an Indian; but because it is the name of a town in England—from whence some of the settlers came, or upon which they had their eye. Such is the fact; and it is a fact which we should have been nearly as sure of, if the details of the foundation of Boston of Massachusets were unknown, as we are now.

The presence of Englishmen in the two Bostons would have been conclusive; the chances against a people connected with one Boston falling in *accidentally* with another Boston ready-made (as it were) in respect to name, being incalculably great.

But what if the Boston in Massachusets were the *older* name of the two? Difficulties would arise. We could not then derive it from the Boston in Lincolnshire.

It is not necessary to carry this hypothetical illustration farther: *mutatis mutandis*, the argument which it involves applies to the *Goths* and the *Getæ*.

a. The names are alike: indeed by the later writers *Getæ* is used as equivalent to *Gothic;* and in Pliny we find *Gaudæ* by the side of *Getæ*.

b. The supposed country of the *Goths* is Germany: the undoubted country of the *Getæ* is the Lower Danube.

c. Of the two names that of the *Getæ* is the older.

In this case we *really* have the difficulty so lately indicated.

Emigrants, with the name *Gothi*, leave Germany; and, of all the countries in the world, settle in one belonging to a people with a name so like their own as that of the *Getæ* acci-

dentally. It may safely be said, that if this has happened at all, it has happened against great odds.

Yet the solution is obscure; we cannot well suppose the *Gothi* to have migrated from the land of the *Getæ;* whilst the notion that the *Getæ* came from the *Gothi*, is set aside by the greater antiquity of the former name (*Getæ*).

Is there any other explanation?

In what may be called the Getic hypothesis, it is held that the Goths were Getæ, and the Getæ Goths, *from the beginning;* in other words, the second of the assumed facts is denied, *viz.*, the origin of the Goths in Germany, and the migration from that country. There was no migration at all. The Goths were on the Lower Danube from the beginning, and they were known to the earlier Greek and Latin writers as Getæ.

Such the doctrine. Now, as there is the evidence of more than one good writer of antiquity, as to the Thracians being in the same category with the Getæ, the Thracians must have been Gothic as well. Hence the questions involved in the hypothesis in question are of considerable magnitude.

Such is the point of view from which the views developed in Grimm's History of the German Language, must be seen in the first instance. The details by which it is supported are elaborate, but eminently unsatisfactory. Reasons for thinking them unnecessary are given in the sequel,* where the difficulty arising from the similarity of name is admitted, but differently explained.

§ XV. ON NATIVE AND FOREIGN NAMES.

The natives of the British Principality are called by the English *Welsh.* They call themselves *Kymry.*

The natives of the rest of South Britain call themselves *English.* Their Welsh (Kymry) neighbours call them *Sassenach* = *Saxons.* So do the Scotch and Irish Gaels. So do the Manksmen of the Isle of Man.

The Germans call themselves *Deutsche.* The English call no one but the people of Holland *Dutch.* They call the other allied families *Germans.*

* Epilegomena, in § on the *Goths.*

The people of Finland call themselves *Quains*. Most of their neighbours call them *Finns*.

The Laplanders call themselves *Sabme* (*Sâme*). The Norwegians call them *Finns*. *Fin*mark means *Lap*-mark.

The hill-tribes of India have *no collective* name at all. Each tribe has its separate denomination. The collective names *Khond*, *Bhil*, *Sûr*, &c., are all Hindu.

The Slavonians vary the name with the nation. The Germans they call *Niemcy*, the Finns *Tshûd*.

The Germans call all Slavonians *Wends*. No Slavonian calls himself so.

This list of the difference between native and foreign designations might be greatly extended. The present instances merely illustrate the extent to which the difference occurs.

In ancient writers we are seldom sure of the name applied to a given population being *native*. We should rather look for it in the language of the population that supplied the information.

From which it follows that we can rarely assume that any name belongs to the language of the population to which it applies; and this creates a difficulty too often overlooked.

I never allow myself to assume this indigenous origin of a national name, except under the following circumstances:—

1. When the information concerning a nation is known to be drawn from the nation itself at first-hand.—Thus, all that *Cæsar* writes concerning the Germans I attribute to Gallic sonrces; and, consequently, assume the names to be Gallic also. They *may* be German as well; but this is an accident. He may also in certain exceptional cases have taken the German designation. The general rule, however, is, that the name belongs to the language of the informants.

2. When the name has a meaning in the language to which it applies.—Thus, *Marc-o-manni* is so truly German that, even in Cæsar, I believe it to be native. How often it may be safe to assume such a meaning is another question.

3. When the name is one out of two or many.—Believing (as, with many better judges, I do) that the words *Catti* and *Suevi* are different names for the same people, and

also believing that, next to the Gauls, the Germans themselves supplied the Romans with information concerning Germany, I consider it more likely that one of the two should be German and native, than that either the Germans or the Gauls should have used two synonymous designations.

4. When the name of the nation is the same as that of some national hero.—Thus, the fact that the Greeks recognized *Hellen* as the patriarch of their stock would, even if it stood alone, be good reason for considering the name *Hellenes* to be indigenous.

5. When the name contains a sound found in the language to which it applies, but not found in the language of the most likely informants—*E.g.*, I believe the word *Thule* to have been taken direct from some Norse informant, because it contains the Norse sound of þ (*th*), a sound too rare to be supposed to have come from another language.

6. When the name is very *particular* and *specific*.—The names that one nation gives another are mostly *generic* and *collective*. They have seldom a vocabulary sufficiently full for the divisions and subdivisions of any family but their own. On the other hand, a very generic and collective power is *primâ facie* evidence of the name to which it is attached *not* being native.

Writers, from whom it is unsafe to differ—as far as they go on any principles at all, and exercise any doubt whatever upon the subject—will possibly add another characteristic of indigenous use. They may consider that the general and undoubted vernacular use of a given name at one period may be a conclusive argument in favour of its vernacular use originally. The natural reluctance of a whole nation to take to itself a designation given it by another, may be urged in favour of this view. I submit, that this is entirely a question of degree; and that it depends on the relative influence and importance of the two nations involved. The modern name *Belgium* is, undoubtedly, anything but native, *i.e.*, in its immediate application. It is a Roman word, in a Roman form, and all that can be said in favour of its Belgic character is, that the country to which it applies supplied the Latin language with the most essential part of it. Nevertheless, it

is a word of Roman make; one which never has been developed in the country itself.

That it is foreign we know; and we know it because it has been assigned within the memory of man. But what if it had been assigned in the obscure days of the third and fourth centuries? It would undoubtedly have passed for native.

At the same time I admit that, in order for one nation to adopt the name by which it is known to another, there must be a very favourable combination of circumstances; *e.g.*—

a. There must be a considerable difference in the power of the two populations; the weaker taking the name from the stronger only when the fact of its relative weakness is evident.

b. Or there must be intermixture.

c. Or there must be more than one nation to use the foreign term, whilst only one upholds the native.

Contrary to many, I am dissatisfied with the evidence which makes two very important words native and German—*Suabia* (*Suevi*) and *Saxon.* I think each of these was directly *Roman*, and remotely *Keltic.* Hence, to the objection against their *non*-Germanic character, founded upon their undoubted adoption by undoubted German populations, I suggest the fact that their adoption was favoured by the support of two languages (the Roman and the Keltic) against the German single-handed.

More specific reasons will be found in the sequel.* At present I merely illustrate a line of criticism.

§ XVI. LIMITATIONS IN THE WAY OF ETYMOLOGY.

The etymology of national names is generally considered a powerful instrument in ethnological research.

It is doubtful, however, whether much has been done by it.

Few writers admit any one's etymologies but their own. This is a proof of the arbitrary method in which the practice is carried out.

* *Epilegomena,* § *Suevi.*

In the name *Cherusci* some of the best writers of Germany find the root *heru* = *sword*. Hence, the Cherusci are *swords*, and, by extension, *swords-men*.

But there is another nation mentioned by Tacitus, called *Suard-ones*. *Suard* = *sword*; and, hence, *Cherusci* = *Suard-ones*, and *vice versâ*.

Thirdly, as *sahs* = *dagger*; *dagger* = *sword*, the *Saxons* are the men of the *sahs*. Hence, *Saxon* = *Suardones* = *Cherusci*, and the three tribes are the same.

I give this as an illustration of an investigation; valuable, if true. But the truth is doubtful.

In most investigations of this sort, two series of facts are overlooked.

1. The language to which the derivational process is applied.—How many have sought for a *German* meaning to the word *Germani*, without submitting it to the previous inquiry as to whether the name were German at all.

2. The likelihood of the name itself.—I will not deny that nations may be found who give themselves such names as *Sword*, *Dagger*, *Knife*, &c. I only argue that the induction by which such names can be shown fitting to an unknown case, has yet to be made.

A fact that eminently invalidates this kind of criticism, is the habit of numerous nations themselves. Many of them are so far from supposing that their name has an intelligible origin, that they exhibit an unconscious confession of their ignorance. The Greeks (for instance) and many Oriental nations explain their name by supposing that it is that of the patriarch of their stock—their eponymus. Thus the *Hellenes* derive themselves from *Hellen*, the *Turks* from *Turk*, &c. They would not do this if, in the full command of their own tongue, and in a period comparatively near the origin of their name, there was some custom or attribute connected with themselves which would explain it better.

I think the etymology of *simple uncompounded* national names dangerous and unscientific. In a few cases it is admissible—but only in a few. In the present volume I adopt the accredited meaning of three *simple uncompounded* names only

—*Franks*,* *Æstyi*,† *Jazyges*.‡ With *compounds and derivatives*, it is different. One part of the word helps to verify another, and so error gets guarded against.

In *compound* words, then, only—such as *Marc-o-manni*, and *Boio-hemum* (with the three exceptions given above) shall I allow myself to argue from the etymology to any ulterior conclusion.

§ XVII. ON THE TERM *MARCOMANNI*.

In respect to its form, *Marc-o-manni* is one of the most satisfactory words of antiquity.

It first appears in Cæsar's notice of the subjects and allies of Ariovistus. The fact of Cæsar's informants being Gauls, and the greater part of his nomenclature being Gallic, is the only difficulty that accompanies the notion of the German being the language in which its meaning is to be sought.

But this is only the shadow of a shade; inasmuch as the undoubtedly German authorities, in which it afterwards occurs, do away with all doubt as to the tongue to which it belongs.

Nevertheless, why this should be German, when Cæsar's other names are Gallic, is not so easy to say.

Its form is full and perfect. There are the two elements which make it a compound (*mark* + *man*) and the copula (-*o*-) which connects them.

Mark = *march*, and *mann* = *man*, so that *Marc-o-manni* = *men of the marches*.

From this derivation I draw three points of great importance in the practice of ethnological criticism, points which, so far as I am aware, have never been sufficiently attended to; at any rate, they have never been made the basis of so much inference as they will be in the following pages.

1. The first of these is the possibility of the number of *Marc-o-manni* being numerous; as numerous as the number

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Franks*. † See Note *ad*, *voc*.
‡ See Page 16.

of the *marches*. Something of the kind has been admitted; and *Marchmen*, over and above those of Ariovistus and the Marcomannic war, have been recognised. But not to the extent necessary to do away with the difficulties of the question. The Gallic march, on the confines of Germany and Gaul—the Slavonic march, falling into different divisions according to the different parts of the lengthy frontier—the Roman march, on the confines of those parts of Vindelicia, and the Decumates Agri which acknowledged the supremacy of the empire—and the Northern march, on the side of the unascertained frontier of Sleswick-Holstein—each, or any of these, may have supplied the name *Marc-o-manni*. I do not say that they all have done so. I only say that such may have been the case. If so, how hasty it is to assume that the *Marc-o-manni* of different times and different localities are one and the same representatives of a separate substantive nation as truly as Cherusci or Chamavi are — locomotive, migratory, and well-nigh ubiquitous. No one in England imagines that the history of the Welsh *Marchmen*, is that of the *Marchmen* of the Scottish border, and that the frontagers which we find in Shropshire and Chester, are descendants of those of Westmoreland and Cumberland; bodily moved from one area to another by migration—or, *vice versâ*. No! There were as many *Marchmen* as *Marches*, and as many *Marches* as frontiers. I do not, at present, say that the *Marcomanni* of Ariovistus and the *Marcomanni* of Maroboduus belonged to different sections of the Germanic stock; since what is written, at present, is meant as an illustration rather than an argument. I only say that it is likely that they did so—the one being the Marchmen of the Gallic, the other the Marchmen of the Rhæto-Vindelican, or Rhæto-Pannonian march; possibly as different from each other as the retainers of the ancient lords of the marches of Alnwick and Ludlow respectively.

2. The next is the strong likelihood of the great majority of the marches of the ancient *Marcomanni* coinciding with the boundaries of different *stocks*, *races*, *varieties*, or whatever we call those great divisions of the human species which we designate by the terms Gothic, Slavonic, and Keltic. I say

great likelihood, because I am unwilling to overstate the case. *Marks* of minor magnitude may have existed—marks between different members of the same stock; between, for instance, the Catti and Cherusci, the Cherusci and Chauci, &c. This, again, is what we find at home. The Welsh marches separated the Saxon from the Kelt: the Scottish, the southron Saxon from the northern. Still I think that the existence of a march, sufficiently important to be mentioned by the Roman historians, is *primâ facie* evidence of the existence of an ethnological difference of considerable magnitude.

3. The third is the *linear* character of the dimensions of a march. A boundary which separates one area from another is surely narrower than either of the areas which it separates. A march as broad as it is long is no march at all. To this, however, there is an objection. One nation may so encroach upon another that the march, or line of boundaries, is continually advancing. Now if the *name* be retained whilst the *line* becomes protruded, the *breadth* of a march may become as notable as its length. Thus, if the North American settlers had called each county which abutted on the Indian frontier the *march*, and if those counties had retained their names, there would now be a series of areas, so named, reaching from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains. And this is really the case in Germany, where we have the oldest line of frontier between the Slavonians and Germans, called *Alt-mark* (the *old* march); the next, *Mittel-mark* (the middle march); and the third, *Ucker-mark* the march of the Ucrii (a Slavonic population so-called).

4. There is also another element of uncertainty. Suppose the Humber was called the river *March*. The people on it might be called *Marchmen*, though not on a march. In such a case, certain Yorkshiremen would appear to form the frontier, when, really, they did not do so. By this, the writer who argued from the name only would imagine that the non-English area began at Hull instead of at Roxburgh; and the English area would lose all Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland.

Now, reverse this supposition, and let the Spey be called the *March*. In this case, the men on its banks would appear

to form the frontier, when, really, it was on the Tweed. By this, the writer, who argued from the name only, would imagine that the non-English area was at Cromarty instead of Roxburgh, and the English area would lose all Fife, Aberdeen, and the Lothians.

Now *Maros*, a word not unlike *March*, is the name of the river of Moravia, and Moravia is in the neighbourhood of the *Marc-o-manni*.

Notwithstanding these objections, I shall use the term *Marc-o-manni* as an instrument of criticism, and (to anticipate) Bohemia is the country in which it will most especially be applied.

§ XVIII. IRREGULARITY OF SIZE OF ETHNOLOGICAL AREAS.

It is probable that I may appear too careless about the *size* I give to certain ethnological areas, *e.g.*, the Frisian, the Slavonic, and others; so as to look like a writer who finds his Frisians, his Slavonians, or his any other equally-favoured nation everywhere.

To anticipate this, I remark, that not only are large areas —areas far larger than any given to any population in the following pages—the commonest of ethnological phenomena, but that they generally stand in the neighbourhood of small ones; so that the contrast between a multiplicity of ethnological differences within a small area, and great ethnological uniformity over a large one, is the normal condition of the world. Thus—

a. In *Asia*—the vast Turk, Mongol, Chinese, and Persian areas, are contrasted with the small ones of the Caucasian, Himalayan, and Siberian populations.

b. In *Africa*—the Berber and Kaffre are similarly great; the Felup, Sapi, Nalu, &c., similarly small.

c. In *America*—the Eskimo, Athabaskans, Algonkins, and Guarani take up half of the continent. On the lower Mississippi there are eight or ten mutually unintelligible tongues within an area the size of Yorkshire.

§ XIX. CÆSAR'S NOTICES OF THE GERMANS.

Of so much more importance than the remarks of all other writers upon Germany are those of Cæsar, that the chief extracts from the Bellum Gallicum bearing upon that country will be given *in extenso*. They require, however, certain preliminary remarks.

First comes the distinction between what Cæsar observed for himself and what he learned from others. Of these latter, his chief informants were Gauls, and chief amongst the Gauls, most probably, Divitiacus the Æduan. The parts of Germany which an Æduan would best understand would be those of the Middle Rhine—Hesse, Franconia, and the northern parts of Suabia. The name by which these Germans were known was *Suevi*.

Another point to notice, is the likelihood of the Germans thus described having spoken Gallic to the Gauls, instead of the Gauls having learned German: inasmuch as there is the special statement that Ariovistus spoke the language of the country he had invaded; and that it was in Gallic that he made himself intelligible to the Romans. There is no evidence of any Gaul speaking German.

Hence, it will not be surprising if many of the names in Cæsar are as little German as the name *Welsh* is Cambrian. Without, at present, saying how far such is the case, it is enough to remark that, amongst the German populations of Cæsar, there is only one whereof the name is unequivocally German, as tested by its structure and etymology. This word is *Marcomanni* = *Marchmen*, or *men of the boundaries*.

Of the Germans of Ariovistus, Cæsar's knowledge was personal; but these were intrusive emigrants rather than true Germans, *i.e.*, Germans in a Gallic locality, and (probably for that reason) partially Gallicised. The Germans for the parts between Bonn and Nimeguen, were also similarly known.

Lastly, he speaks from his study of previous writers, quoting Eratosthenes for the extent and name of the Hercynian forest.

That Cæsar was the chief first-hand authority for the main details concerning early Germany, is evident; at the same time it is not in Cæsar that the classification into Ingævones, Istævones, &c., is to be found. Neither is it in Cæsar that the parts which were not visited until after his time are described. The broad distinction between Gaul and German *is* his; the Gaul being taken as the type.

The extent to which the names in Cæsar differ from those of Tacitus creates certain slight difficulties. His *no*-mention of the *Catti* is a most remarkable instance of this. That Cæsar's names are chiefly Gallic, whilst Tacitus's are Germanic, is, in the mind of the present writer, the chief explanation here.

The *greatest* difficulty lies in the second and third extracts, wherein certain *Belgian* populations are made German. I can only reconcile this with the great preponderance of evidence in favour of the Belgæ being *Gauls*, by considering the term *Belgic* in the book of Cæsar to be political rather than ethnological; in other words, to denote a *confederation* rather than a homogeneous nation. At the same time we may admit both intermixture* and intrusion.

These preliminaries precede the following extracts; the criticism of which will find its place in different parts of the body of the book.

CÆS. BELL. GALL. I.

XXX. Bello Helvetiorum confecto, totius fere Galliæ legati, principes civitatum, ad Cæsarem gratulatum convenerunt: "intelligere sese, tametsi, pro veteribus Helvetiorum injuriis populi Romani, ab iis pœnas bello repetisset, tamen eam rem non minus ex usu terræ Galliæ, quam populi Romani accidisse, propterea quod eo consilio florentissimis rebus domos suas Helvetii reliquissent, uti toti Galliæ bellum inferrent, imperioque potirentur, locumque domicilio ex magna copia deligerent, quem ex omni Gallia opportunissimum ac fructuosissimum judicassent, reliquasque civitates stipendiarias haberent." Petierunt, "uti sibi concilium totius Galliæ in diem certam indicere, idque Cæsaris voluntate facere

* See *Epilegomena*, § *on the Quasi-Germanic populations*.

liceret: sese habere quasdam res, quas ex communi consensu ab eo petere vellent." Ea re permissa, diem concilio constituerunt et jurejurando, ne quis enunciaret, nisi quibus communi consilio mandatum esset, inter se sanxerunt.

XXXI. Eo concilio dimisso, iidem principes civitatum, qui ante fuerant ad Cæsarem, reverterunt petieruntque, uti sibi secreto in occulto de sua omniumque salute cum eo agere liceret. Ea re impetrata, sese omnes flentes Cæsari ad pedes projecerunt: "non minus se id contendere et laborare, ne ea, quæ dixissent, enunciarentur, quam uti ea, quæ vellent, impetrarent, propterea quod, si enunciatum esset, summum in cruciatum se venturos viderent." Locutus est pro his Divitiacus Æduus: "Galliæ totius factiones esse duas; harum alterius principatum tenere Æduos, alterius Arvernos. Hi quum tantopere de potentatu inter se multos annos contenderent, factum esse, uti ab Arvernis Sequanisque Germani mercede arcesserentur. Horum primo circiter millia xv. Rhenum transisse: posteaquam agros et cultum et copias Gallorum homines feri ac barbari adamassent, transductos plures; nunc esse in Gallia ad c. et xx. millium numerum: cum his Æduos eorumque clientes semel atque iterum armis contendisse: magnam calamitatem pulsos accepisse, omnem nobilitatem, omnem senatum, omnem equitatum amisisse. Quibus prœliis calamitatibusque fractos, qui et sua virtute, et populi Romani hospitio atque amicitia plurimum ante in Gallia potuissent, coactos esse Sequanis obsides dare, nobilissimos civitatis, et jurejurando civitatem obstringere, sese neque obsides repetituros, neque auxilium a populo Romano imploraturos, neque recusaturos, quo minus perpetuo sub illorum ditione atque imperio essent. Unum se esse ex omni civitate Æduorum, qui adduci non potuerit, ut juraret, aut liberos suos obsides daret. Ob eam rem se ex civitate profugisse et Romam ad senatum venisse, auxilium postulatum, quod solus neque jurejurando neque obsidibus teneretur. Sed pejus victoribus Sequanis, quam Æduis victis, accidisse, propterea quod Ariovistus, rex Germanorum, in eorum finibus consedisset tertiamque partem agri Sequani, qui esset optimus totius Galliæ, occupavisset et nunc de altera parte tertia Sequanos decedere juberet, propterea quod paucis mensibus

ante *Harudum** millia hominum xxiv. ad eum venissent, quibus locus ac sedes pararentur. Futurum esse paucis annis, uti omnes ex Galliæ finibus pellerentur atque omnes Germani Rhenum transirent: neque enim conferendum esse Gallicum cum Germanorum agro, neque hanc consuetudinem victus cum illa comparandam. Ariovistum autem, ut semel Gallorum copias prœlio vicerit, quod prœlium factum sit ad Magetobriam, superbe et crudeliter imperare, obsides nobilissimi cujusque liberos poscere et in eos omnia exempla cruciatusque edere, si qua res non ad nutum aut ad voluntatem ejus facta sit: hominem esse barbarum, iracundum, temerarium: non posse ejus imperia diutius sustineri. Nisi si quid in Cæsare populoque Romano sit auxilii, omnibus Gallis idem esse faciundum, quod Helvetii fecerint, ut domo emigrent, aliud domicilium, alias sedes, remotas a Germanis petant fortunamque, quæcumque accidat, experiantur. Hæc si enunciata Ariovisto sint, non dubitare, quin de omnibus obsidibus, qui apud eum sint, gravissimum supplicium sumat. Cæsarem vel auctoritate sua atque exercitus, vel recenti victoria, vel nomine populi Romani deterrere posse, ne major multitudo Germanorum Rhenum transducatur; Galliamque omnem ab Ariovisti injuria posse defendere."

XXXII. Hac oratione ab Divitiaco habito, omnes, qui aderant, magno fletu auxilium a Cæsare petere cœperunt. Animadvertit Cæsar, unos ex omnibus Sequanos nihil earum rerum facere, quas ceteri facerent, sed tristes, capite demisso, terram intueri. Ejus rei caussa quæ esset miratus ex ipsis quæsiit. Nihil Sequani respondere, sed in eadem tristitia taciti permanere. Quum ab iis sæpius quæreret, neque ullam omnino vocem exprimere posset, idem Divitiacus Æduus respondit: "Hoc esse miseriorem gravioremque fortunam Sequanorum præ reliquorum, quod soli ne in occulto quidem queri, neque auxilium implorare auderent, absentisque Ariovisti crudelitatem, velut si coram adesset, horrerent: propterea quod reliquis tamen fugæ facultas daretur; Sequanis vero, qui intra fines suos Ariovistum recepissent, quorum oppida omnia in potestate ejus essent, omnes cruciatus essent perferendi."

* When a name is printed in Italics, it will be noticed in the *Epilegomena*.

XXXIII. His rebus cognitis, Cæsar Gallorum animos verbis confirmavit, pollicitusque est, sibi eam rem curæ futuram: magnam se habere spem, et beneficio suo, et auctoritate adductum Ariovistum finem injuriis facturum. Hac oratione habita, concilium dimisit, et secundum ea multæ res eum hortabantur, quare sibi rem cogitandam et suscipiendam putaret; imprimis quod Æduos, fratres consanguineosque sæpenumero a senatu adpellatos, in servitute atque in ditione videbat Germanorum teneri, eorumque obsides esse apud Ariovistum ac Sequanos intelligebat: quod in tanto imperio populi Romani turpissimum sibi et reipublicæ esse arbitrabatur. Paullatim autem Germanos consuescere Rhenum transire; et in Galliam magnam eorum multitudinem venire, populo Romano periculosum videbat: neque sibi homines feros ac barbaros, temperaturos existimabat, quin, quum omnem Galliam occupassent, ut ante Cimbri Teutonique fecissent, in provinciam exirent atque inde in Italiam contenderent; præsertim quum Sequanos a provincia nostra Rhodanus divideret. Quibus rebus quam maturime occurrendum putabat. Ipse autem Ariovistus tantos sibi spiritus, tantam adrogantiam sumserat, ut ferendus non videretur.

XXXIV. Quamobrem placuit ei, ut ad Ariovistum legatos mitteret, qui ab eo postularent, uti aliquem locum medium utriusque colloquio diceret; velle sese de republica et summis utriusque rebus cum eo agere. Ei legationi Ariovistus respondit: "Si quid ipsi a Cæsare opus esset, sese ad eum venturum fuisse; si quid ille se velit, illum ad se venire oportere. Præterea se neque sine exercitu in eas partes Galliæ venire audere, quas Cæsar possideret; neque exercitum sine magno commeatu atque emolimento in unum locum contrahere posse: sibi autem mirum videri, quid in sua Gallia, quam bello vicisset, aut Cæsari, aut omnino populo Romano negotii esset."

XXXV. His responsis ad Cæsarem relatis, iterum ad eum Cæsar legatos cum his mandatis mittit: "Quoniam tanto suo populique Romani beneficio adfectus, quum in consulatu suo rex atque amicus a senatu adpellatus esset, hanc sibi populoque Romano gratiam referret, ut in colloquium venire invitatus gravaretur, neque de communi re dicendum sibi et

cognoscendum putaret; hæc esse, quæ ab eo postularet; primum, ne quam hominum multitudinem amplius trans Rhenum in Galliam transduceret: deinde obsides, quos haberet ab Æduis, redderet Sequanisque permitteret, ut, quos illi haberent, voluntate ejus reddere illis liceret; neve Æduos injuria lacesseret, neve his sociisve eorum bellum inferret: si id ita fecissit, sibi populoque Romano perpetuam gratiam atque amicitiam cum eo futuram: si non impetraret, sese, quoniam M. Messala, M. Pisone Coss. senatus censuisset, uti, quicumque Galliam provinciam obtineret, quod commodo reipublicæ facere posset, Æduos ceterosque amicos populi Romani defenderet, sese Æduorum injurias non neglecturum."

XXXVI. Ad hæc Ariovistus respondit: "Jus esse belli, ut, qui vicissent, iis, quos vicissent, quemadmodum vellent, imperarent: item populum Romanum victis non ad alterius præscriptum, sed ad suum arbitrium imperare consuesse. Si ipse populo Romano non præscriberet, quemadmodum suo jure uteretur; non oportere sese a populo Romano in suo jure impediri. Æduos sibi, quoniam belli fortunam tentassent et armis congressi ac superati essent, stipendiarios esse factos. Magnam Cæsarem injuriam facere, qui suo adventu vectigalia sibi deteriora faceret. Æduis se obsides redditurum non esse, neque iis, neque eorum sociis injuria bellum illaturum, si in eo manerent, quod convenisset, stipendiumque quotannis penderent; si id non fecissent, longe iis fraternum nomen populi Romani afuturum. Quod sibi Cæsar denunciaret, se Æduorum injurias non neglecturum; neminem secum sine sua pernicie contendisse. Quum vellet, congrederetur; intellecturum, quid invicti Germani exercitatissimi in armis, qui inter annos quatuordecim tectum non subissent virtute possent."

XXXVII. Hæc eodem tempore Cæsari mandata referebantur, et legati ab Æduis et a Treviris veniebant: Ædui questum, quod Harudes, qui nuper in Galliam transportati essent, fines eorum popularentur; sese ne obsidibus quidem datis pacem Ariovisti redimere potuisse: Treviri autem, pagos centum Suevorum ad ripas Rheni consedisse, qui Rhenum transire conarentur; iis præesse Nasuam et Cimberium fratres. Quibus rebus Cæsar vehementer commotus,

maturandum sibi existimavit, ne, si nova manus Suevorum cum veteribus copiis Ariovisti sese conjunxisset, minus facile resisti posset. Itaque re frumentaria, quam celerrime potuit, comparata, magnis itineribus ad Ariovistum contendit.

XXXVIII. Quum tridui viam processisset, nunciatum est ei, Ariovistum cum suis omnibus copiis ad occupandum Vesontionem, quod est oppidum maximum Sequanorum, contendere, triduique viam a suis finibus processisse. Id ne accideret, magno opere sibi præcavendum Cæsar existimabat: namque omnium rerum, quæ ad bellum usui erant, summa erat in eo oppido facultas; idque natura loci sic muniebatur, ut magnam ad ducendum bellum daret facultatem, propterea quod flumen Dubis, ut circino, circumductum, pæne totum oppidum cingit: reliquum spatium, quod est non amplius pedum DC., qua flumen intermittit, mons continet magna altitudine, ita ut radices montis ex utraque parte ripæ fluminis contingant. Hunc murus circumdatus arcem efficit et cum oppido conjungit. Huc Cæsar magnis nocturnis diurnisque itineribus contendit, occupatoque oppido, ibi præsidium collocat.

XXXIX. Dum paucos dies ad Vesontionem rei frumentariæ commeatusque caussa moratur, ex percunctatione nostrorum vocibusque Gallorum ac mercatorum, qui ingenti magnitudine corporum Germanos, incredibili virtute atque exercitatione in armis esse prædicabant, sæpenumero sese cum eis congressos ne vultum quidem atque aciem oculorum ferre potuisse, tantus subito timor omnem exercitum occupavit, ut non mediocriter omnium mentes animosque perturbaret. Hic primum ortus est a tribunis militum, præfectis reliquisque, qui, ex urbe amicitiæ caussa Cæsarem secuti, non magnum in re militari usum habebant: quorum alius, alia caussa illata, quam sibi ad proficiscendum necessariam esse dicerent, petebant, ut ejus voluntate discedere liceret: nonnulli, pudore adducti, ut timoris suspicionem vitarent, remanebant. Hi neque vultum fingere, neque interdum lacrimas tenere poterant: abditi in tabernaculis aut suum fatum querebantur, aut cum familiaribus suis commune periculum miserabantur. Vulgo totis castris testamenta obsignabantur. Horum vocibus ac timore paullatim etiam ii, qui magnum in castris usum habebant, milites centurionesque, quique equitatu præerant,

perturbabantur. Qui se ex his minus timidos existimari volebant, non se hostem vereri, sed angustias itineris et magnitudinem silvarum, quæ intercederent inter ipsos atque Ariovistum, aut rem frumentariam, ut satis commode supportari posset, timere dicebant. Nonnulli etiam Cæsari renunciabant, quum castra moveri ac signa ferri jussisset, non fore dicto audientes milites, neque propter timorem signa laturos.

XL. Hæc quum animadvertisset, convocato consilio, omniumque ordinum ad id consilium adhibitis centurionibus, vehementer eos incusavit: 'primum, quod, aut quam in partem, aut quo concilio ducerentur, sibi quærendum aut cogitandum putarent. Ariovistum, se consule, cupidissime populi Romani amicitiam adpetisse; cur hunc tam temere quisquam ab officio discessurum judicaret? Sibi quidem persuaderi, cognitis suis postulatis atque æquitate conditionum perspecta, eum neque suam, neque populi Romani gratiam repudiaturum. Quod si furore atque amentia impulsus bellum intulisset, quid tandem vererentur? aut cur de sua virtute, aut de ipsius diligentia desperarent? Factum ejus hostis periculum patrum nostrorum memoria, quum, Cimbris et Teutonis a C. Mario pulsis, non minorem laudem exercitus, quam ipse imperator, meritus videbatur: factum etiam nuper in Italia servili tumultu, quos tamen aliquid usus ac disciplina quam a nobis accepissent, sublevarent. Ex quo judicari posset, quantum haberet in se boni constantia; propterea quod, quos aliquamdiu inermos sine caussa timuissent, hos postea armatos ac victores superassent. Denique hos esse eosdem, quibuscum sæpenumero Helvetii congressi, non solum in suis, sed etiam in illorum finibus, plerumque superarint, qui tamen pares esse nostro exercitui non potuerint. Si quos adversum prœlium et fuga Gallorum commoveret, hos, si quærerent, reperire posse, diuturnitate belli defatigatis Gallis, Ariovistum, quum multos menses castris se ac paludibus tenuisset, neque sui potestatem fecisset, desperantes jam de pugna et dispersos subito adortum, magis ratione et consilio, quam virtute, vicisse. Cui rationi contra homines barbaros atque imperitos locus fuisset, hac ne ipsum quidem sperare nostros exercitus capi posse. Qui suum timorem in rei frumentariæ simulationem angustiasque itinerum conferrent,

facere adroganter, quum aut de officio imperatoris desperare aut præscribere viderentur. Hæc sibi esse curæ; frumentum Sequanos, Leucos, Lingonas subministrare; jamque esse in agris frumenta matura; de itinere ipsos brevi tempore judicaturos. Quod non fore dicto audientes milites, neque signa laturi dicantur, nihil se ea re commoveri: scire enim, quibuscumque exercitus dicto audiens non fuerit, aut, male re gesta, fortunam defuisse; aut, aliquo facinore comperto, avaritiam esse convictam. Suam innocentiam perpetua vita, felicitatem Helvetiorum bello esse perspectam. Itaque se, quod in longiorem diem collaturus esset, repræsentaturum et proxima nocte de quarta vigilia castra moturum, ut quam primum intelligere posset, utrum apud eos pudor atque officium, an timor valeret. Quod si præterea nemo sequatur, tamen se cum sola decima legione iturum, de qua non dubitaret; sibique eam prætoriam cohortem futuram." Huic legioni Cæsar et indulserat præcipue, et propter virtutem confidebat maxime.

XLI. Hac oratione habita, mirum in modum conversæ sunt omnium mentes, summaque alacritas et cupiditas belli gerendi innata est, princepsque decima legio per tribunos militum ei gratias egit, quod de se optimum judicium fecisset, seque esse ad bellum gerendum paratissimam confirmavit. Deinde reliquæ legiones per tribunos militum et primorum ordinum centuriones egerunt, uti Cæsari satisfacerent: se neque umquam dubitasse, neque timuisse, neque de summa belli suum judicium, sed imperatoris esse, existimavisse. Eorum satisfactione accepta et itinere exquisito per Divitiacum, quod ex aliis ei maximam fidem habebat, ut millium amplius quinquaginta circuitu locis apertis exercitum duceret de quarta vigilia, ut dixerat, profectus est. Septimo die, quum iter non intermitteret, ab exploratoribus certior factus est, Ariovisti copias a nostris millibus passuum quatuor et viginti abesse.

XLII. Cognito Cæsaris adventu, Ariovistus legatos ad eum mittit: quod antea de colloquio postulasset, id per se fieri licere, quoniam propius accessisset: seque id sine periculo facere posse existimare. Non respuit conditionem Cæsar: jamque eum ad sanitatem reverti arbitrabatur,

quum id, quod antea petenti denegasset, ultro polliceretur; magnamque in spem veniebat, pro suis tantis populique Romani in eum beneficiis, cognitis suis postulatis, fore, uti pertinacia desisteret. Dies colloquio dictus est, ex eo die quintus. Interim quum sæpe ultro citroque legati inter eos mitterentur, Ariovistus postulavit, ne quem peditem ad colloquium Cæsar adduceret: vereri se, ne per insidias ab eo circumveniretur: uterque cum equitatu veniret; alia ratione se non esse venturum. Cæsar, quod neque colloquium interposita caussa tolli volebat, neque salutem suam Gallorum equitatui committere audebat, commodissimum esse statuit, omnibus equis Gallis equitibus detractis, eo legionarios milites legionis decimæ, cui quam maxime confidebat, imponere, ut præsidium quam amicissimum, si quod opus facto esset, haberet. Quod quum fieret, non irridicule quidam ex militibus decimæ legionis dixit: "plus, quam pollicitus esset, Cæsarem ei facere: pollicitum, se in cohortis prætoriæ loco decimam legionem habiturum, nunc ad equum rescribere."

XLIII. Planicies erat magna, et in ea tumulus terrenus satis grandis. Hic locus æquo fere spatio ab castris utrisque aberat. Eo, ut erat dictum, ad colloquium venerunt. Legionem Cæsar, quam equis devexerat, passibus ducentis ab eo tumulo constituit. Item equites Ariovisti pari intervallo constiterunt. Ariovistus, ex equis et colloquerentur et, præter se, denos ut ad colloquium adducerent, postulavit. Ubi eo ventum est, Cæsar initio orationis sua senatusque in eum beneficia commemoravit, "quod rex adpellatus esset a senatu, quod amicus, quod munera amplissima missa: quam rem et paucis contigisse, et pro magnis hominum officiis consuesse tribui" docebat: "illum, quum neque aditum, neque caussam postulandi justam haberet, beneficio ac liberalitate sua ac senatus ea præmia consecutum." Docebat etiam, "quam veteres, quamque justæ caussæ necessitudinis ipsis cum Æduis intercederent, quæ senatus consulta, quoties, quamque honorifica in eos facta essent: ut omni tempore totius Galliæ principatum Ædui tenuisent, prius etiam, quam nostram amicitiam adpetissent; populi Romani hanc esse consuetudinem, ut socios atque amicos non modo sui nihil deperdere, sed gratia, dignitate, honore auctiores velit esse:

quod vero ad amicitiam populi Romani adtulissent, id iis eripi, quis pati posset?" Postulavit deinde eadem, quæ legatis in mandatis dederat, "ne aut Æduis, aut eorum sociis bellum inferret; obsides redderet; si nullam partem Germanorum domum remittere posset, at ne quos amplius Rhenum transire pateretur."

XLIV. Ariovistus ad postulata Cæsaris pauca respondit: de suis virtutibus multa prædicavit: "Transisse Rhenum sese, non sua sponte, sed rogatum et arcessitum a Gallis; non sine magna spe magnisque præmiis domum propinquosque reliquisse; sedes habere in Gallia, ab ipsis concessas; obsides ipsorum voluntate datos; stipendium capere jure belli quod victores victis imponere consuerint; non sese Gallis, sed Gallos sibi bellum intulisse; omnes Galliæ civitates ad se oppugnandum venisse, ac contra se castra habuisse; eas omnes copias a se uno prœlio fusas ac superatas esse; si iterum experiri velint, iterum paratum sese decertare; si pace uti velint, iniquum esse, de stipendio recusare, quod sua voluntate ad id tempus dependerint. Amicitiam populi Romani sibi ornamento et præsidio, non detrimento, esse oportere, idque se ea spe petisse. Si per populum Romanum stipendium remittatur et dedititii subtrahantur, non minus libenter sese recusaturum populi Romani amicitiam, quam adpetierit. Quod multitudinem Germanorum in Galliam transducat, id se sui muniendi, non Galliæ impugnandæ caussa facere: ejus rei testimonium esse, quod, nisi rogatus, non venerit, et quod bellum non intulerit, sed defenderit. Se prius in Galliam venisse, quam populum Romanum. Numquam ante hoc tempus exercitum populi Romani Galliæ provinciæ fines egressum. Quid sibi vellet? Cur in suas possessiones veniret? Provinciam suam hanc esse Galliam, sicut illam nostram. Ut ipsi concedi non oporteret, si in nostros fines impetum faceret: sic item nos esse iniquos, qui in suo jure se interpellaremus. Quod fratres a senatu Æduos adpellatos diceret, non se tam barbarum, neque tam imperitum esse rerum, ut non sciret, neque bello Allobrogum proximo Æduos Romanis auxilium tulisse, neque ipsos in his contentionibus, quas Ædui secum et cum Sequanis habuissent, auxilio populi Romani usos esse. Debere se suspicari,

simulata Cæsarem amicitia, quod exercitum in Gallia habeat, sui opprimendi caussa habere. Qui nisi decedat atque exercitum deducat ex his regionibus, sese illum non pro amico, sed pro hoste habiturum: quod si eum interfecerit, multis sese nobilibus principibusque populi Romani gratum esse facturum: id se ab ipsis per eorum nuncios compertum habere, quorum omnium gratiam atque amicitiam ejus morte redimere posset. Quod si decessisset et liberam possessionem Galliæ sibi tradidisset, magno se illum præmio remuneraturum et, quæcumque bella geri vellet, sine ullo ejus labore et periculo confecturum."

XLV. Multa ab Cæsare in eam sententiam dicta sunt, quare negotio desistere non posset, et "neque suam, neque populi Romani consuetudinem pati, uti optime meritos socios desereret: neque se judicare, Galliam potius esse Ariovisti, quam populi Romani. Bello superatos esse Arvernos et Rutenos ab Q. Fabio Maximo, quibus populus Romanus ignovisset, neque in provinciam redegisset, neque stipendium imposuisset. Quod si antiquissimum quodque tempus spectari oporteret, populi Romani justissimum esse in Gallia imperium: si judicium senatus observari oporteret, liberam debere esse Galliam, quam bello victam suis legibus uti voluisset."

XLVI. Dum hæc in colloquio geruntur, Cæsari nunciatum est, equites Ariovisti propius tumulum accedere et ad nostros adequitare, lapides telaque in nostros conjicere. Cæsar loquendi finem fecit seque ad suos recepit suisque imperavit, ne quod omnino telum in hostes rejicerent. Nam etsi sine ullo periculo legionis delectæ cum equitatu prœlium fore videbat; tamen committendum non putabat, ut, pulsis hostibus, dici posset, eos ab se per fidem in colloquio circumventos. Posteaquam in vulgus militum elatum est, qua adrogantia in colloquio Ariovistus usus omni Gallia Romanis interdixisset, impetumque in nostros ejus equitis fecissent eaque res colloquium ut diremisset: multo major alacritas studiumque pugnandi majus exercitu injectum est.

XLVII. Biduo post Ariovistus ad Cæsarem legatos mittit, velle se de his rebus, quæ inter eos agi cœptæ, neque perfectæ essent, agere cum eo: uti aut iterum colloquio diem constitueret; aut, si id minus vellet, ex suis legatis aliquem

ad se mitteret. Colloquendi Cæsari caussa visa non est, et eo magis, quod pridie ejus diei Germani retineri non poterant, quin in nostros tela conjicerent. Legatum ex suis sese magno cum periculo ad eum missurum, et hominibus feris objecturum existimabat. Commodissimum visum est, C. Valerium Procillum, C. Valerii Caburi filium, summa virtute et humanitate adolescentem (cujus pater a C. Valerio Flacco civitate donatus erat), et propter fidem, et propter linguæ Gallicæ scientiam, qua multa jam Ariovistus longinqua consuetudine utebatur, et quod in eo peccandi Germanis caussa non esset, ad eum mittere, et M. Mettium, qui hospitio Ariovisti usus erat. His mandavit, ut, quæ diceret Ariovistus, cognoscerent et ad se referrent. Quos quum apud se in castris Ariovistus conspexisset, exercitu suo præsente, conclamavit: "Quid ad se venirent? An speculandi caussa?" Conantis dicere prohibuit et in catenas conjecit.

XLVIII. Eodem die castra promovit et millibus passuum sex a Cæsaris castris sub monte consedit. Postridie ejus diei præter castra Cæsaris suas copias transduxit et millibus passuum duobus ultra eum castra fecit, eo consilio, uti frumento commeatuque, qui ex Sequanis et Æduis supportaretur, Cæsarem intercluderet. Ex eo die dies continuos quinque Cæsar pro castris suas copias produxit et aciem instructam habuit, ut, si vellet Ariovistus prœlio contendere, ei potestas non deesset. Ariovistus his omnibus diebus exercitum castris continuit; equestri prœlio quotidie contendit. Genus hoc erat pugnæ, quo se Germani exercuerant. Equitum millia erant sex: totidem numero pedites velocissimi ac fortissimi; quos ex omni copia singuli singulos, suæ salutis caussa, delegerant. Cum his in prœliis versabantur, ad hos se equites recipiebant: hi, si quid erat durius, concurrebant: si qui, graviore vulnere accepto, equo deciderat, circumsistebant: si quo erat longius prodeundum, aut celerius recipiendum, tanta erat horum exercitatione celeritas, ut, jubis equorum sublevati, cursum adæquarent.

XLIX. Ubi eum castris se tenere Cæsar intellexit, ne diutius commeatu prohiberetur, ultra eum locum, quo in loco Germani consederant, circiter passus sexcentos ab eis, castris idoneum locum delegit, acieque triplici instructa, ad

eum locum venit. Primam et secundam aciem in armis esse, tertiam castra munire jussit. Hic locus ab hoste circiter passus sexcentos, uti dictum est, aberat. Eo circiter hominum numero XVI. millia expedita cum omni equitatu Ariovistus misit, quæ copiæ nostros perterrerent et munitione prohiberent. Nihilo secius Cæsar, ut ante constituerat, duas acies hostem propulsare, tertiam opus perficere jussit. Munitis castris, duas ibi legiones reliquit et partem auxiliorum; quatuor reliquas in castra majora reduxit.

L. Proximo die, instituto suo, Cæsar e castris utrisque copias suas eduxit; paullumque a majoribus progressus aciem instruxit hostibusque pugnandi potestatem fecit. Ubi ne tum quidem eos prodire intellexit, circiter meridiem exercitum in castra reduxit. Tum demum Ariovistus partem suarum copiarum, quæ castra minora oppugnaret, misit: acriter utrimque usque ad vesperum pugnatum est. Solis occasu suas copias Ariovistus, multis et illatis et acceptis vulneribus, in castra reduxit. Quum ex captivis quæreret Cæsar, quam ob rem Ariovistus prœlio non decertaret; hanc reperiebat caussam, quod apud Germanos ea consuetudo esset, ut matres familiæ eorum sortibus et vaticinationibus declararent, utrum prœlium committi ex usu esset, nec ne: eas ita dicere: "Non esse fas, Germanos superare, si ante novam lunam prœlio contendissent."

LI. Postridie ejus diei Cæsar præsidio utrisque castris, quod satis esse visum est, reliquit, omnis alarios in conspectu hostium pro castris minoribus constituit, quod minus multitudine militum legionariorum pro hostium numero valebat, ut ad speciem alariis uteretur. Ipse, triplici instructa acie, usque ad castra hostium accessit. Tum demum necessario Germani suas copias castris eduxerunt, generatimque constituerunt paribusque intervallis Harudes, Marcomannos, Triboccos, Vangiones, Nemetes, *Sedusios*, Suevos, omnemque aciem suam rhedis et carris circumdederunt, ne qua spes in fuga relinqueretur. Eo mulieres imposuerunt, quæ in prœlium proficiscentes milites passis crinibus flentes implorabant, ne se in servitutem Romanis traderent.

LII. Cæsar singulis legionibus singulos legatos et quæstorem præfecit, uti eos testis suæ quisque virtutis haberet.

Ipse a dextro cornu, quod eam partem minime firmam hostium esse animum adverteret, prœlium commisit. Ita nostri acriter in hostes, signo dato, impetum fecerunt itaque hostes repente celeriterque procurrerunt, ut spatium pila in hostes conjiciendi non daretur. Rejectis pilis, comminus gladiis pugnatum est: at Germani, celeriter ex consuetudine sua phalange facta, impetus gladiorum exceperunt. Reperti sunt complures nostri milites, qui in phalangas insilirent et scuta manibus revellerent et desuper vulnerarent. Quum hostium acies a sinistro cornu pulsa atque in fugam conversa esset, a dextro cornu vehementer multitudine suorum nostram aciem premebant. Id quum animadvertisset P. Crassus adolescens, qui equitatu præerat, quod expeditior erat, quam hi, qui inter aciem versabantur, tertiam aciem laborantibus nostris subsidio misit.

LIII. Ita prœlium restitutum est, atque omnes hostes terga verterunt, neque prius fugere destiterunt, quam ad flumen Rhenum millia passuum ex eo loco circiter quinquaginta pervenerunt. Ibi perpauci aut viribus confisi transnatare contenderunt, aut lintribus inventis sibi salutem repererunt. In his fuit Ariovistus, qui, naviculam deligatam ad ripam nactus, ea profugit: reliquos omnes consecuti equites nostri interfecerunt. Duæ fuerunt Ariovisti uxores, una Sueva natione, quam ab domo secum eduxerat; altera Norica, regis Vocionis soror, quam in Gallia duxerat, a fratre missam: utræque in ea fuga perierunt. Duæ filiæ harum, altera occisa, altera capta est. C. Valerius Procillus, quum a custodibus in fuga trinis catenis vinctus traheretur, in ipsum Cæsarem, hostis equitatu persequentem, incidit. Quæ quidem res Cæsari non minorem, quam ipsa victoria, voluptatem adtulit, quod hominem honestissimum provinciæ Galliæ, suum familiarem et hospitem, ereptum e manibus hostium, sibi restitutum videbat, neque ejus calamitate de tanta voluptate et gratulatione quidquam fortuna deminuerat. Is, se præsente, de se ter sortibus consultum dicebat, utrum igni statim necaretur, an in aliud tempus reservaretur; sortium beneficio se esse incolumem. Item M. Mettius repertus et ad eum reductus est.

LIV. Hoc prœlio trans Rhenum nunciato, Suevi, qui ad

ripas Rheni venerant, domum reverti cœperunt: quos *Ubii*, qui proximi Rhenum incolunt, perterritos insecuti, magnum ex his numerum occiderunt. Cæsar, una æstate duobus maximis bellis confectis, maturius paullo, quam tempus anni postulabat, in hiberna in Sequanos exercitum deduxit: hibernis Labienum præposuit: ipse in citeriorem Galliam ad conventus agendos profectus est.

CÆS. BELL. GALL. II.

IV. Quum ab his quæreret, quæ civitates, quantæque in armis essent, et quid in bello possent, sic reperiebat: plerosque *Belgas esse ortos ab Germanis;* Rhenumque antiquitus transductos, propter loci fertilitatem ibi consedisse, Gallosque, qui ea loca incolerent, expulisse; solosque esse, qui, patrum nostrorum memoria, omni Gallia vexata, Teutonos Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerint. Qua ex re fieri, uti earum rerum memoria magnam sibi auctoritatem magnosque spiritus in re militari sumerent. De numero eorum omnia se habere explorata, Remi dicebant, propterea quod propinquitatibus adfinitatibusque conjuncti, quantam quisque multitudinem in communi Belgarum concilio ad id bellum pollicitus sit, cognoverint. Plurimum inter eos Bellovacos et virtute, et auctoritate, et hominum numero valere: hos posse conficere armata millia centum: pollicitos ex eo numero electa XL., totiusque belli imperium sibi postulare. Suessiones suos esse finitimos, latissimos feracissimosque agros possidere. Apud eos fuisse regem nostra etiam memoria Divitiacum, totius Galliæ potentissimum, qui quum magnæ partis harum regionum, tum etiam Britanniæ imperium obtinuerit: nunc esse regem Galbam: ad hunc, propter justitiam prudentiamque, totius belli summam omnium voluntate deferri: oppida habere numero XII., pollicere millia armata quinquaginta; totidem Nervios, qui maxime feri inter ipsos habeantur longissimeque absint: XV. millia Atrebates: Ambianos X. millia: Morinos XXV. millia: Menapios IX. millia: Caletos X. millia: Velocasses et Veromanduos totidem: Aduatucos XXIX. millia, Condrusos, Eburones, Cæræsos, Pæmanos, *qui uno nomine Germani adpellantur*, arbitrari ad XL. millia.

CÆS. BELL. GALL. II.

XV. Eorum fines Nervii adtingebant: quorum de natura moribusque Cæsar quum quæreret, sic reperiebat: "Nullum aditum esse ad eos mercatoribus: nihil pati vini reliquarumque rerum, ad luxuriam pertinentium, inferri, quod iis rebus relanguescere animos et remitti virtutem existimarent: esse homines feros magnæque virtutis: increpitare atque incusare reliquos Belgas, qui se populo Romano dedidissent patriamque virtutem projecissent: confirmare, sese neque legatos missuros, neque ullam conditionem pacis accepturos."

CÆS. BELL. GALL. IV.

I. Ea, quæ secuta est, hieme, qui fuit annus Cn. Pompeio, M. Crasso Coss., Usipetes Germani et item Tenchtheri magna cum multitudine hominum flumen Rhenum transierunt, non longe a mari, quo Rhenus influit. Caussa transeundi fuit, quod ab Suevis complures annos exagitati bello premebantur et agricultura prohibebantur. Suevorum gens est longe maxima et bellicosissima Germanorum omnium, Hi centum pagos habere dicuntur, ex quibus quotannis singula millia armatorum bellandi caussa ex finibus educunt. Reliqui, qui domi manserint, se atque illos alunt. Hi rursus in vicem anno post in armis sunt; illi domi remanent. Sic neque agricultura, nec ratio atque usus belli intermittitur. Sed privati ac separati agri apud eos nihil est, neque longius anno remanere uno in loco incolendi caussa licet. Neque multum frumento, sed maximam partem lacte atque pecore vivunt multumque sunt in venationibus: quæ res et cibi genere, et quotidiana exercitatione, et libertate vitæ (quod, a pueris nullo officio aut disciplina adsuefacti, nihil omnino contra voluntatem faciant) et vires alit, et immani corporum magnitudine homines efficit. Atque in eam se consuetudinem adduxerunt, ut locis frigidissimis, neque vestitus, præter pellis, habeant quidquam (quarum propter exiguitatem magna est corporis pars aperta), et laventur in fluminibus.

II. Mercatoribus est ad eos aditus magis eo, ut, quæ bello ceperint, quibus vendant, habeant, quam quo ullam rem ad se importari desiderent: quin etiam jumentis, quibus maxime

Gallia delectatur, quæque impenso parant pretio, Germani importatitiis non utuntur: sed quæ sunt apud eos nata, prava atque deformia, hæc quotidiana exercitatione, summi ut sint laboris, efficiunt. Equestribus prœliis sæpe ex equis desiliunt ac pedibus prœliantur; equosque eodem remanere vestigio adsuefaciunt; ad quos se celeriter, quum usus est, recipiunt: neque eorum moribus turpius quidquam aut inertius habetur, quam ephippiis uti. Itaque ad quemvis numerum ephippiatorum equitum, quamvis pauci, adire audent. Vinum ad se omnino importari non sinunt, quod ea re ad laborem ferendum remollescere homines atque effeminari arbitrantur.

III. Publice maximam putant esse laudem, quam latissime a suis finibus vacare agros: hac re significari, magnum numerum civitatum suam vim sustinere non posse. Itaque una ex parte a Suevis circiter millia passuum DC. agri vacare dicuntur. Ad alteram partem succedunt Ubii (quorum fuit civitas ampla atque florens, ut est captus Germanorum), et paullo, quam sunt ejusdem generis, et ceteris humaniores, propterea quod Rhenum adtingunt multumque ad eos mercatores ventitant et ipsi propter propinquitatem Gallicis sunt moribus adsuefacti. Hos quum Suevi, multis sæpe bellis experti propter amplitudinem gravitatemque civitatis, finibus expellere non potuissent, tamen vectigales sibi fecerunt ac multo humiliores infirmioresque redegerunt.

IV. In eadem caussa fuerunt Usipetes et Tenchtheri, quos supra diximus, qui complures annos Suevorum vim sustinuerunt; ad extremum tamen agris expulsi et multis Germaniæ locis triennium vagati ad Rhenum pervenerunt: quas regiones Menapii incolebant et ad utramque ripam fluminis agros, ædificia vicosque habebant; sed tantæ multitudinis aditu perterriti, ex his ædificiis, quæ trans flumen habuerant, demigraverunt et, cis Rhenum dispositis præsidiis, Germanos transire prohibebant. Illi, omnia experti, quum neque vi contendere propter inopiam navium, neque clam transire propter custodias Menapiorum possent, reverti se in suas sedes regionesque simulaverunt: et tridui viam progressi, rursus reverterunt atque, omni hoc itinere una nocte equitatu confecto, inscios inopinantesque Menapios oppresserunt, qui, de Germanorum discessu per exploratores certiores

facti, sine metu trans Rhenum in suos vicos remigraverant. His interfectis navibusque eorum occupatis, priusquam ea pars Menapiorum, quæ citra Rhenum quieta in suis sedibus erat, certior fieret, flumen transierunt atque, omnibus eorum ædificiis occupatis, reliquam partem hiemis se eorum copiis aluerunt.

V. His de rebus Cæsar certior factus, et infirmitatem Gallorum veritus, quod sunt in consiliis capiendis mobiles et novis plerumque rebus student, nihil his committendum existimavit. Est autem hoc Gallicæ consuetudinis, uti et viatores, etiam invitos, consistere cogant et, quod quisque eorum de quaque re audierit aut cognoverit, quærant et mercatores in oppidis vulgus circumsistat, quibusque ex regionibus veniant, quasque ibi res cognoverint, pronunciare cogant. His rumoribus atque auditionibus permoti, de summis sæpe rebus consilia ineunt, quorum eos e vestigio pœnitere necesse est, quum incertis rumoribus serviant et plerique ad voluntatem eorum ficta respondeant.

VI. Qua consuetudine cognita, Cæsar, ne graviori bello occurreret, maturius, quam consuerat, ad exercitum proficiscitur. Eo quum venisset, ea, quæ fore suspicatus erat, facta cognovit, missas legationes ab nonnullis civitatibus ad Germanos, invitatosque eos, uti ab Rheno discederent; omniaque quæ postulassent, ab se fore parata. Qua spe adducti Germani latius jam vagabantur et in finis Eburonum et Condrusorum, qui sunt Trevirorum clientes, pervenerant. Principibus Galliæ evocatis, Cæsar ea, quæ cognoverat, dissimulanda sibi existimavit, eorumque animis permulsis et confirmatis equitatuque imperato, bellum cum Germanis gerere constituit.

VII. Re frumentaria comparata equitibusque delectis, iter in ea loca facere cœpit, quibus in locis esse Germanos audiebat. A quibus quum paucorum dierum iter abesset, legati ab his venerunt, quorum hæc fuit oratio: "Germanos neque priores populo Romano bellum inferre, neque tamen recusare, si lacessantur, quin armis contendant; quod Germanorum consuetudo hæc sit a majoribus tradita, quicumque bellum inferant, resistere, neque deprecari: hæc tamen dicere, venisse invitos, ejectos domo. Si suam gratiam

Romani velint, posse eis utiles esse amicos: vel sibi agros attribuant, vel patiantur eos tenere, quos armis possederint. Sese unis Suevis concedere, quibus ne dii quidem immortales pares esse possint: reliquum quidem in terris esse neminem, quem non superare possint."

VIII. Ad hæc Cæsar, quæ visum est, respondit; sed exitus fuit orationis: "Sibi nullam cum his amicitiam esse posse, si in Gallia remanerent: neque verum esse, qui suos fines tueri non potuerint, alienos occupare: neque ullos in Gallia vacare agros, qui dari tantæ præsertim multitudini, sine injuria possint. Sed licere, se velint, in Ubiorum finibus considere, quorum sint legati apud se et de Suevorum injuriis querantur et a se auxilium petant; hoc se ab iis impetraturum.'

IX. Legati hæc se ad suos relaturos dixerunt et, re deliberata, post diem tertium ad Cæsarem reversuros: interea ne propius se castra moveret, petierunt. "Ne id quidem Cæsar ab se impetrari posse" dixit; cognoverat enim, magnam partem equitatus ab iis aliquot diebus ante prædandi frumentandique caussa ad Ambivaritos trans Mosam missam. Hos exspectari equites atque ejus rei caussa moram interponi, arbitrabatur.

X. Mosa profluit ex monte Vosego, qui est in finibus Lingonum, et, parte quadam ex Rheno recepta, quæ adpellatur Vahalis insulamque efficit Batavorum, in Oceanum influit, neque longius ab Oceano millibus passuum LXXX. in Rhenum transit. Rhenus autem oritur ex Lepontiis, qui Alpes incolunt, et longo spatio per fines Nantuatium, Helvetiorum, Sequanorum, Mediomatricorum, Tribucorum, Trevirorum citatus fertur et, ubi Oceano adpropinquat, in plures diffluit partes, multis ingentibusque insulis effectis, quarum pars magna a feris barbarisque nationibus incolitur (ex quibus sunt, qui piscibus atque ovis avium vivere existimantur) multisque capitibus in Oceanum influit.

XI. Cæsar quum ab hoste non amplius passuum XII. millibus abesset, ut erat constitutum, ad eum legati revertuntur: qui, in itinere congressi, magnopere, ne longius progrederetur, orabant. Quum id non impetrassent, petebant, uti ad eos equites, qui agmen antecessissent, præmit-

teret, eosque pugna prohiberet; sibique uti potestatem faceret, in Ubios legatos mittendi: quorum si principes ac senatus sibi jurejurando fidem fecissent, ea conditione, quæ a Cæsare ferretur, se usuros ostendebant: ad has res conficiendas sibi tridui spatium daret. Hæc omnia Cæsar eodem illo pertinere arbitrabatur, ut, tridui mora interposita, equites eorum, qui abessent, reverterentur: tamen sese non longius millibus passuum quatuor aquationis caussa processurum eo die dixit: huc postero die quam frequentissimi convenirent, ut de eorum postulatis cognosceret. Interim ad præfectos, qui cum omni equitatu antecesserant, mittit, qui nunciarent, ne hostes prœlio lacesserent et, si ipsi lacesserentur, sustinerent, quoad ipse cum exercitu propius accessisset.

XII. At hostes, ubi primum nostros equites conspexerunt, quorum erat quinque millium numerus, quum ipsi non amplius DCCC. equites haberent, quod ii, qui frumentandi caussa ierant trans Mosam, nondum redierant, nihil timentibus nostris, quod legati eorum paullo ante a Cæsare discesserant, atque is dies induciis erat ab eis petitus, impetu facto, celeriter nostros perturbaverunt. Rursus resistentibus nostris, consuetudine sua ad pedes desiluerunt, subfossisque equis compluribusque nostris dejectis, reliquos in fugam conjecerunt atque ita perterritos egerunt, ut non prius fuga desisterent, quam in conspectum agminis nostri venissent. In eo prœlio ex equitibus nostris interficiuntur quatuor et septuaginta, in his vir fortissimus, Piso, Aquitanus, amplissimo genere natus, cujus avus in civitate sua regnum obtinuerat, amicus ab senatu nostro adpellatus. Hic quum fratri intercluso ab hostibus auxilium ferret, illum ex periculo eripuit: ipse equo vulnerato dejectus, quoad potuit, fortissime restitit. Quum circumventus, multis vulneribus acceptis, cecidisset, atque id frater, qui jam prœlio excesserat, procul animum advertisset, incitato equo se hostibus obtulit atque interfectus est.

XIII. Hoc facto prœlio, Cæsar neque jam sibi legatos audiendos, neque conditiones accipiendas arbitrabatur ab his, qui per dolum atque insidias, petita pace, ultro bellum intulissent: exspectare vero, dum hostium copiæ augerentur equitatusque reverteretur, summæ dementiæ esse judicabat et, cognita Gallorum infirmitate, quantum jam apud eos hostes uno prœ-

lio auctoritatis essent consecuti, sentiebat: quibus ad consilia capienda nihil spatii dandum existimabat. His constitutis rebus et consilio cum legatis et quæstore communicato, ne quem diem pugnæ prætermitteret, opportunissima res accidit, quod postridie ejus diei mane eadem et perfidia et simulatione usi Germani, frequentes, omnibus principibus majoribusque natu adhibitis, ad eum in castra venerunt; simul, ut dicebatur, sui purgandi caussa, quod contra, atque esset dictum et ipsi petissent, prœlium pridie commisissent; simul ut, si quid possent, de induciis fallendo impetrarent. Quos sibi Cæsar oblatos gavisus, illos retineri jussit; ipse omnes copias castris eduxit, equitatumque, quod recenti prœlio perterritum esse existimabat, agmen subsequi jussit.

XIV. Acie triplici instituta, et celeriter VIII. millium itinere confecto, prius ad hostium castra pervenit, quam, quid ageretur, Germani sentire possent. Qui, omnibus rebus subito perterriti, et celeritate adventus nostri, et discessu suorum, neque consilii habendi, neque arma capiendi spatio dato, perturbantur, copiasne adversus hostem educere, an castra defendere, an fuga salutem petere, præstaret. Quorum timor quum fremitu et concursu significaretur, milites nostri, pristini diei perfidia incitati, in castra irruperunt. Quorum qui celeriter arma capere potuerunt, paullisper nostris restiterunt atque inter carros impedimentaque prœlium commiserunt: at reliqua multitudo puerorum mulierumque (nam cum omnibus suis domo excesserant Rhenumque transierant) passim fugere cœpit; ad quos consectandos Cæsar equitatum misit.

XV. Germani, post tergum clamore audito, quum suos interfici viderent, armis abjectis signisque militaribus relictis, se ex castris ejecerunt: et, quum ad confluentem Mosæ et Rheni pervenissent, reliqua fuga desperata, magno numero interfecto, reliqui se in flumen præcipitaverunt atque ibi timore, lassitudine, vi fluminis oppressi perierunt. Nostri ad unum omnes incolumes, perpaucis vulneratis, ex tanti belli timore, quum hostium numerus capitum CCCCXXX. millium fuisset, se in castra receperunt. Cæsar his, quos in castris retinuerat, discedendi potestatem fecit: illi supplicia cruciatusque Gallorum veriti, quorum agros vexaverant, remanere

se apud eum velle dixerunt. His Cæsar libertatem concessit.

XVI. Germanico bello confecto, multis de caussis Cæsar statuit, sibi Rhenum esse transeundum: quarum illa fuit justissima, quod, quum videret, Germanos tam facile impelli, ut in Galliam venirent, suis quoque rebus eos timere voluit, quum intelligerent, et posse et audere populi Romani exercitum Rhenum transire. Accessit etiam, quod illa pars equitatus Usipetum et Tenchtherorum, quam supra commemoravi prædandi frumentandique caussa Mosam transisse, neque prœlio interfuisse, post fugam suorum se trans Rhenum in fines *Sigambrorum* receperat neque cum iis conjunxerat. Ad quos quum Cæsar nuncios misisset, qui postularent, eos, qui sibi Galliæque bellum intulissent, sibi dederent, responderunt: "Populi Romani imperium Rhenum finire: si, se invito Germanos in Galliam transire, non æquum existimaret, cur sui quidquam esse imperii aut potestatis trans Rhenum postularet?" Ubii autem, qui uni ex transrhenanis ad Cæsarem legatos miserant, amicitiam fecerant, obsides dederant, magnopere orabant, "ut sibi auxilium ferret, quod graviter ab Suevis premerentur; vel, si id facere occupationibus reipublicæ prohiberetur, exercitum modo Rhenum transportaret: id sibi ad auxilium spemque reliqui temporis satis futurum: tantum esse nomen atque opinionem ejus exercitus, Ariovisto pulso et hoc novissimo prœlio facto, etiam ad ultimas Germanorum nationes, uti opinione et amicitia populi Romani tuti esse possint." Navium magnam copiam ad transportandum exercitum pollicebantur.

XVII. Cæsar his de caussis, quas commemoravi, Rhenum transire decreverat; sed navibus transire, neque satis tutum esse arbitrabatur, neque suæ neque populi Romani dignitatis esse statuebat. Itaque, etsi summa difficultas faciundi pontis proponebatur propter latitudinem, rapiditatem altitudinemque fluminis, tamen id sibi contendendum, aut aliter non transducendum exercitum, existimabat. Rationem pontis hanc instituit. Tigna bina sesquipedalia, paullum ab imo præacuta, dimensa ad altitudinem fluminis, intervallo pedum duorum inter se jungebat. Hæc quum machinationibus immissa in flumen defixerat fistucisque adegerat, non

sublicæ modo derecta ad perpendiculum, sed prona ac fastigata, ut secundum naturam fluminis procumberent: iis item contraria duo, ad eumdem modum juncta, intervallo pedum quadragenum, ab inferiore parte, contra vim atque impetum fluminis conversa statuebat. Hæc utraque insuper bipedalibus trabibus immissis, quantum eorum tignorum junctura distabat, binis utriumque fibulis ab extrema parte, distinebantur: quibus disclusis atque in contrariam partem revinctis, tanta erat operis firmitudo atque ea rerum natura, ut, quo major vis aquæ se incitavisset, hoc artius illigata tenerentur. Hæc derecta materie injecta contexebantur et longuriis cratibusque consternebantur; ac nihilo secius sublicæ et ad inferiorem partem fluminis oblique agebantur, quæ, pro pariete subjectæ et cum omni opere conjunctæ, vim fluminis exciperent: et aliæ item supra pontem mediocri spatio, ut, si arborum trunci sive naves dejiciendi operis essent a barbaris missæ, his defensoribus earum rerum vis minueretur, neu ponti nocerent.

XVIII. Diebus decem, quibus materia cœpta erat comportari, omni opere effecto, exercitus transducitur. Cæsar, ad utramque partem pontis firmo præsidio relicto, in fines Sigambrorum contendit. Interim a compluribus civitatibus ad eum legati veniunt, quibus pacem atque amicitiam petentibus liberaliter respondit obsidesque ad se adduci jubet. At Sigambri ex eo tempore, quo pons institui cœptus est, fuga comparata, hortantibus iis, quos ex Tenchtheris atque Usipetibus apud se habebant, finibus suis excesserant, suaque omnia exportaverant, seque in solitudinem ac silvas abdiderant.

XIX. Cæsar, paucos dies in eorum finibus moratus, omnibus vicis ædificiisque incensis frumentisque succisis, se in fines Ubiorum recepit; atque iis auxilium suum pollicitus, si ab Suevis premerentur, hæc ab iis cognovit: Suevos, posteaquam per exploratores pontem fieri comperissent, more suo concilio habito, nuncios in omnes partes dimisisse, uti de oppidis demigrarent, liberos, uxores, suaque omnia in silvas deponerent atque omnes, qui arma ferre possent, unum in locum convenirent: hunc esse delectum medium fere regionum earum, quas Suevi obtinerent: hic Romanorum

adventum exspectare atque ibi decertare constituisse. Quod ubi Cæsar comperit, omnibus his rebus confectis, quarum rerum caussa transducere exercitum constituerat, ut Germanis metum injiceret, ut Sigambros ulcisceretur, ut Ubios obsidione liberaret, diebus omnino x. et VIII. trans Rhenum consumtis, satis et ad laudem et ad utilitatem profectum arbitratus, se in Galliam recepit pontemque rescidit.

CÆS. BELL. GALL. VI.

IX. Cæsar, postquam ex Menapiis in Treviros venit, duabus de caussis Rhenum transire constituit: quarum erat altera, quod auxilia contra se Treviris miserant; altera, ne Ambiorix ad eos receptum haberet. His constitutis rebus, paullum supra eum locum, quo ante exercitum transduxerat, facere pontem instituit. Nota atque instituta ratione, magno militum studio, paucis diebus opus efficitur. Firmo in Treviris præsidio ad pontem relicto, ne quis ab iis subito motus oriretur, reliquas copias equitatumque transducit. Ubii, qui ante obsides dederant atque in deditionem venerant, purgandi sui caussa ad eum legatos mittunt, qui doceant, "neque ex sua civitate auxilia in Treviros missa, neque ab se fidem læsam:" petunt atque orant, "ut sibi parcat, ne communi odio Germanorum innocentes pro nocentibus pœnas pendant:" si amplius obsidum velit, dare pollicentur. Cognita Cæsar caussa reperit, ab Suevis auxilia missa esse, Ubiorum satisfactionem accepit, aditus viasque in Suevos perquirit.

X. Interim paucis post diebus fit ab Ubiis certior, Suevos omnes unum in locum copias cogere atque iis nationibus, quæ sub eorum sint imperio, denunciare, uti auxilia peditatus equitatusque mittant. His cognitis rebus, rem frumentariam providet, castris idoneum locum deligit, Ubiis imperat, ut pecora deducant suaque omnia ex agris in oppida conferant, sperans, barbaros atque imperitos homines, inopia cibariorum adductos, ad iniquam pugnandi conditionem posse deduci: mandat, ut crebros exploratores in Suevos mittant, quæque apud eos gerantur, cognoscant. Illi imperata faciunt et paucis diebus intermissis referunt, "Suevos omnes, posteaquam certiores nuncii de exercitu Romanorum venerint, cum omnibus suis sociorumque copiis, quas coegissent, penitus ad

extremos fines sese recepisse: silvam esse ibi infinita magnitudine, quæ adpellatur Bacenis, hanc longe introrsus pertinere et, pro nativo muro objectam, Cheruscos ab Suevis, Suevosque ab Cheruscis, injuriis incursionibusque prohibere: ad ejus initium silvæ Suevos adventum Romanorum exspectare constituisse."

XI. Quoniam ad hunc locum perventum est, non alienum esse videtur, de Galliæ Germaniæque moribus, et quo differant hæ nationes inter sese, proponere. In Gallia non solum in omnibus civitatibus atque in omnibus pagis partibusque, sed pæne etiam in singulis domibus factiones sunt: earumque factionum principes sunt, qui summam auctoritatem eorum judicio habere existimantur, quorum ad arbitrium judiciumque summa omnium rerum consiliorumque redeat. Idque ejus rei caussa antiquitus institutum videtur, ne quis ex plebe contra potentiorem auxilii egeret: suos enim quisque opprimi et circumveniri non patitur, neque, aliter si faciant, ullam inter suos habent auctoritatem. Hæc eadem ratio est in summa totius Galliæ: namque omnes civitates in partes divisæ sunt duas.

XII. Quum Cæsar in Galliam venit, alterius factionis principes erant Ædui, alterius Sequani. Hi quum per se minus valerent, quod summa auctoritas antiquitus erat in Æduis, magnæque eorum erant clientelæ. Germanos atque Ariovistum sibi adjunxerant eosque ad se magnis jacturis pollicitationibusque perduxerant. Prœliis vero compluribus factis secundis, atque omni nobilitate Æduorum interfecta, tantum potentia antecesserant, ut magnam partem clientium ab Æduis ad se transducerent obsidesque ab iis principum filios acciperent et publice jurare cogerent, nihil se contra Sequanos consilii inituros; et partem finitimi agri, per vim occupatam, possiderent Galliæque totius principatum obtinerent. Qua necessitate adductus Divitiacus, auxilii petendi caussa Romam ad senatum profectus, infecta re redierat. Adventu Cæsaris facta commutatione rerum, obsidibus Æduis redditis, veteribus clientelis restitutis, novis per Cæsarem comparatis (quod hi, qui se ad eorum amicitiam adgregaverant, meliore conditione atque æquiore imperio se uti videbant), reliquis rebus eorum, gratia, dignitate amplificata, Sequani principatum dimiserant. In eorum

locum Remi successerant; quos quod adæquare apud Cæsarem gratia intelligebatur, ii, qui propter veteres inimicitias nullo modo cum Æduis conjungi poterant, se Remis in clientelam dicabant. Hos illi diligenter tuebantur. Ita et novam et repente collectam auctoritatem tenebant. Eo tum statu res erat, ut longe principes haberentur Ædui, secundum locum dignitatis Remi obtinerent.

XIII. In omni Gallia eorum hominum, qui aliquo sunt numero atque honore, genera sunt duo: nam plebes pæne servorum habetur loco, quæ per se nihil audet et nullo adhibetur consilio. Plerique, quum aut ære alieno, aut magnitudine tributorum, aut injuria potentiorum prementur, sese in servitutem dicant nobilibus, in hos eadem omnia sunt jura, quæ dominis in servos. Sed de his duobus generibus alterum est Druidum, alterum equitum. Illi rebus divinis intersunt, sacrificia publica ac privata procurant, religiones interpretantur. Ad hos magnus adolescentium numerus disciplinæ caussa concurrit, magnoque ii sunt apud eos honore. Nam fere de omnibus controversiis publicis privatisque constituunt; et, si quod est admissum facinus, si cædes facta, si de hæreditate, si de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt; præmia pœnasque constituunt: si qui aut privatus aut publicus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna apud eos est gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur; iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur. His autem omnibus Druidibus præest unus, qui summam inter eos habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo, si qui ex reliquis excellit dignitate succedit: at, si sunt plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur, nonnumquam etiam armis de principatu contendunt. Hi certo anni tempore in finibus Carnutum, quæ regio totius Galliæ media habetur, considunt in loco consecrato. Huc omnes undique, qui controversias habent, conveniunt eorumque decretis judiciisque parent. Disciplina in Britannia reperta atque inde in Galliam translata esse existimatur: et nunc, qui diligentius eam rem cognoscere volunt, plerumque illo discendi caussa proficiscuntur.

XIV. Druides a bello abesse consuerunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt; militiæ vacationem omniumque rerum habeat immunitatem. Tantis excitati præmiis, et sua sponte multi in disciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquisque mittuntur. Magnum ibi numerum versuum ediscere dicuntur: itaque annos nonnulli vicenos in disciplina permanent. Neque fas esse existimant, ea litteris mandare, quum in reliquis fere rebus, publicis privatisque rationibus, Græcis utantur litteris. Id mihi duabus de caussis instituisse videntur; quod neque in vulgum disciplinam efferri velint, neque eos, qui discant, litteris confisos, minus memoriæ studere; quod fere plerisque accidit, ut præsidio litterarum diligentiam in perdiscendo ac memoriam remittant. In primis hoc volunt persuadere, non interire animas, sed ab aliis post mortem transire ad alios: atque hoc maxime ad virtutem excitari putant, metu mortis neglecto. Multa præterea de sideribus atque eorum motu, de mundi ac terrarum magnitudine, de rerum natura, de deorum immortalium vi ac potestate disputant et juventuti transdant.

XV. Alterum genus est equitum. Hi, quum est usus, atque aliquod bellum incidit (quod ante Cæsaris adventum fere quotannis accidere solebat, uti aut ipsi injurias inferrent, aut illatas propulsarent), omnes in bello versantur: atque eorum ut quisque est genere copiisque amplissimus, ita plurimos circum se ambactos clientesque habent. Hanc unam gratiam potentiamque noverunt.

XVI. Natio est omnis Gallorum admodum dedita religionibus; atque ob eam caussam, qui sunt adfecti gravioribus morbis, quique in prœliis periculisque versantur, aut pro victimis homines immolant, aut se immolaturos vovent administrisque ad ea sacrificia Druidibus utuntur; quod, pro vita hominis nisi hominis vita reddatur, non posse aliter deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur: publiceque ejusdem generis habent instituta sacrificia. Alii immani magnitudine simulacra habent, quorum contexta viminibus membra vivis hominibus complent, quibus succensis, circumventi flamma exanimantur homines. Supplicia eorum, qui in furto, aut in latrocinio, aut aliqua noxa sint comprehensi, gratiora diis immortalibus esse arbitrantur; sed, quum ejus

generis copia deficit, etiam ad innocentium supplicia descendunt.

XVII. Deum maxime Mercurium colunt: hujus sunt plurima simulacra, hunc omnium inventorem artium ferunt, hunc viarum atque itinerum ducem, hunc ad quæstus pecuniæ mercaturasque habere vim maximam arbitrantur. Post hunc, Apollinem et Martem et Jovem et Minervam: de his eamdem fere, quam reliquæ gentes, habent opinionem; Apollinem morbos depellere, Minervam operum atque artificiorum initia transdere; Jovem imperium cælestium tenere; Martem bella regere. Huic, quum prœlio dimicare constituerunt, ea, quæ bello ceperint, plerumque devovent. Quæ superaverint, animalia capta immolant; reliquas res in unum locum conferunt. Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos tumulos locis consecratis conspicari licet: neque sæpe accidit, ut, neglecta quispiam religione, aut capta apud se occultare, aut posita tollere auderet; gravissimumque ei rei supplicium cum cruciatu constitutum est.

XVIII. Galli se omnes ab Dite patre prognatos prædicant, idque ab Druidibus proditum dicunt. Ob eam caussam spatia omnis temporis non numero dierum, sed noctium finiunt; dies natales et mensium et annorum initia sic observant, ut noctem dies subsequatur. In reliquis vitæ institutis hoc fere ab reliquis differunt, quod suos liberos, nisi quum adoleverint, ut munus militiæ sustinere possint, palam ad se adire non patiuntur, filiumque puerili ætate in publico, in conspectu patris, adsistere, turpe ducunt.

XIX. Viri, quantas pecunias ab uxoribus dotis nomine acceperunt, tantas ex suis bonis, æstimatione facta, cum dotibus communicant. Hujus omnis pecuniæ conjunctim ratio habetur, fructusque servantur: uter eorum vita superarit, ad eum pars utriusque cum fructibus superiorum temporum pervenit. Viri in uxores, sicuti in liberos, vitæ necisque habent potestatem: et, quum pater familiæ, illustriore loco natus, decessit, ejus propinqui conveniunt et, de morte si res in suspicionem venit, de uxoribus in servilem modum quæstionem habent et, si compertum est, igni atque omnibus tormentis excrutiatas interficiunt. Funera sunt pro cultu Gallorum magnifica et sumptuosa; omniaque, quæ vivis cordi

fuisse arbitrantur, in ignem inferunt, etiam animalia; ac paullo supra hanc memoriam servi et clientes, quos ab iis dilectos esse constabat, justis funeribus confectis, una cremabantur.

XX. Quæ civitates commodius suam rem publicam administrare existimantur, habent legibus sanctum, si quis quid de re publica a finitimis rumore ac fama acceperit, uti ad magistratum deferat, neve cum quo alio communicet: quod sæpe homines temerarios atque imperitos falsis rumoribus terreri et ad facinus impelli et de summis rebus consilium capere cognitum est. Magistratus, quæ visa sunt, occultant; quæque esse ex usu judicaverint, multitudini produnt. De re publica nisi per concilium loqui non conceditur.

XXI. Germani multum ab hac consuetudine differunt: nam neque Druides habent, qui rebus divinis præsint, neque sacrificiis student. Deorum numero eos solos ducunt, quos cernunt et quorum aperte opibus juvantur, Solem et Vulcanum et Lunam: reliquos ne fama quidem acceperunt. Vita omnis in venationibus atque in studiis rei militaris consistit: ab parvulis labori ac duritiæ student. Qui diutissime impuberes permanserunt, maximam inter suos ferunt laudem: hoc ali staturam, ali hoc vires nervosque confirmari putant. Intra annum vero vicesimum feminæ notitiam habuisse, in turpissimis habent rebus; cujus rei nulla est occultatio, quod et promiscue in fluminibus perluuntur, et pellibus aut parvis rhenonum tegimentis utuntur, magna corporis parte nuda.

XXII. Agriculturæ non student; majorque pars victus eorum in lacte, caseo, carne consistit: neque quisquam agri modum certum aut fines habet proprios: sed magistratus ac principes in annos singulos gentibus cognationibusque hominum, qui una coierint, quantum, et quo loco visum est, agri adtribuunt atque anno post alio transire cogunt. Ejus rei multas adferunt caussas; ne, adsidua consuetudine capti, studium belli gerundi agricultura commutent; ne latos fines parare studeant potentioresque humiliores possessionibus expellant; ne adcuratius ad frigora atque æstus vitandos ædificent; ne qua oriatur pecuniæ cupiditas, qua ex re factiones dissensionesque nascuntur; ut animi æquitate plebem contineant, quum suas quisque opes cum potentissimis æquari videat.

XXIII. Civitatibus maxima laus est, quam latissimas circum se vastatis finibus solitudines habere. Hoc proprium virtutis existimant, expulsos agris finitimos cedere, neque quemquam prope audere consistere: simul hoc se fore tutiores arbitrantur, repentinæ incursionis timore sublato. Quum bellum civitas aut illatum defendit, aut infert: magistratus, qui ei bello præsint, ut vitæ necisque habeant potestatem, deliguntur. In pace nullus est communis magistratus, sed principes regionum atque pagorum inter suos jus dicunt, controversiasque minuunt. Latrocinia nullam habent infamiam, quæ extra fines cujusque civitatis fiunt; atque ea juventutis exercendæ ac desidiæ minuendæ caussa fieri prædicant. Atque, ubi quis ex principibus in concilio dixit, "se ducem fore; qui sequi velint, profiteantur," consurgunt ii, qui et caussam et hominem probant, suumque auxilium pollicentur atque ab multitudine collaudantur: qui ex iis secuti non sunt, in desertorum ac proditorum numero ducuntur omniumque iis rerum postea fides derogatur. Hospites violare, fas non putant; qui quaque de caussa ad eos venerint, ab injuria prohibent sanctosque habent; iis omnium domus patent, victusque communicatur.

XXIV. Ac fuit antea tempus, quum Germanos Galli virtute superarent, ultro bella inferrent, propter hominum multitudinem agrique inopiam trans Rhenum colonias mitterent. Itaque ea, quæ fertilissima sunt, Germaniæ loca circum Hercyniam silvam (quam Eratostheni et quibusdam Græcis fama notam esse video, quam illi Orcyniam adpellant), Volcæ Tectosages occupaverunt atque ibi consederunt. Quæ gens ad hoc tempus iis sedibus sese continet summamque habet justitiæ et bellicæ laudis opinionem: nunc quoque in eadem inopia, egestate, patientia, qua Germani, permanent eodem victu et cultu corporis utuntur; Gallis autem provinciæ propinquitas, et transmarinarum rerum notitia, multa ad copiam atque usus largitur. Paullatim adsuefacti superari, multisque victi prœliis, ne se quidem ipsi cum illis virtute comparant.

XXV. Hujus Hercyniæ silvæ, quæ supra demonstrata est, latitudo novem dierum iter expedito patet: non enim aliter finiri potest, neque mensuras itinerum noverunt. Oritur

ab Helvetiorum et Nemetum et Rauracorum finibus, rectaque fluminis Danubii regione pertinet ad fines Dacorum et Anartium: hinc se flectit sinistrorsus, diversis ab flumine regionibus, multarumque gentium fines propter magnitudinem adtingit; neque quisquam est hujus Germaniæ, qui se aut adisse ad initium ejus silvæ dicat, quum dierum iter LX. processerit, aut quo ex loco oriatur, acceperit. Multa in ea genera ferarum nasci constat, quæ reliquis in locis visa non sint: ex quibus quæ maxime differant ab ceteris et memoriæ prodenda videantur, hæc sunt.

XXVI. Est bos cervi figura, cujus a media fronte inter aures unum cornu exsistit, excelsius magisque directum his, quæ nobis nota sunt, cornibus. Ab ejus summo, sicut palmæ, rami quam late diffunduntur. Eadem est feminæ marisque natura, eadem forma magnitudoque cornuum.

XXVII. Sunt item, quæ adpellantur alces. Harum est consimilis capreis figura et varietas pellium; sed magnitudine paullo antecedunt mutilæque sunt cornibus et crura sine nodis articulisque habent; neque quietis caussa procumbunt, neque, si quo adflictæ casu conciderint, erigere sese aut sublevare possunt. His sunt arbores pro cubilibus: ad eas se adplicant, atque ita, paullum modo reclinatæ, quietem capiunt: quarum ex vestigiis quum est animadversum a venatoribus, quo se recipere consuerint, omnes eo loco aut ab radicibus subruunt, aut accidunt arbores tantum, ut summa species earum stantium relinquatur. Huc quum se consuetudine reclinaverint, infirmas arbores pondere adfligunt atque una ipsæ concidunt.

XXVIII. Tertium est genus eorum, qui uri adpellantur. Hi sunt magnitudine paullo infra elephantos; specie et colore et figura tauri. Magna vis eorum et magna velocitas: neque homini, neque feræ, quam conspexerint, parcunt. Hos studiose foveis captos interficiunt. Hoc se labore durant homines adolescentes atque hoc genere venationis exercent; et, qui plurimos ex his interfecerunt, relatis in publicum cornibus, quæ sint testimonio, magnam ferunt laudem. Sed adsuescere ad homines et mansuefieri, ne parvuli quidem excepti, possunt. Amplitudo cornuum et figura et species multum a nostrorum boum cornibus differt. Hæc studiose

conquisita ab labris argento circumcludunt atque in amplissimis epulis pro poculis utuntur.

§ XX. ARMINIUS AND MAROBODUUS.

After Ariovistus in point of time, but before him in prominence and importance, come the two great Germans, Arminius and Maroboduus; concerning whom the chief texts are from Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus himself. I shall append to these Niebuhr's account of the same events, as it stands in Dr. Schmitz's edition of his Lectures, such being the best way to compare the evidence in its crude and its systematized form. The criticism upon the whole will be found in the body of the work.

VELL. PATERC. II.

CVIII. Nihil erat jam in Germania, quod vinci posset, præter gentem Marcomannorum; quæ, Maroboduo duce excita sedibus suis, atque in interiora refugiens, incinctos Hercynia silva campos incolebat. Nulla festinatio hujus viri mentionem transgredi debet. Maroboduus, genere nobilis, corpore prævalens, animo ferox, natione magis quam ratione barbarus, non tumultuarium, neque fortuitum, neque mobilem et ex voluntate parentium constantem inter suos occupavit principatum; sed, certum imperium vimque regiam complexus animo, statuit, avocata procul a Romanis gente sua, eo progredi, ubi, cum propter potentiora arma refugisset, sua faceret potentissima.

CIX. Occupatis igitur, quos prædiximus, locis, finitimos omnes aut bello domuit, aut conditionibus juris sui fecit: corpus suum custodia munivit: imperium, perpetuis armorum exercitiis (exercitu) pæne ad Romanæ disciplinæ formam redacto, brevi in eminens et nostro quoque imperio timendum perduxit fastigium; gerebatque se ita adversus Romanos, ut neque bello nos lacesseret, et, si lacesseretur, superesse sibi vim ac voluntatem resistendi (ostenderet). Legati, quos mittebat ad Cæsares, interdum ut supplicem commendabant, interdum ut pro pari loquebantur. Gentibus hominibusque a nobis desciscentibus erat apud eum

perfugium; totusque ex male dissimulato agebat æmulum; exercitumque, quem LXX. millium peditum, quatuor equitum, fecerat, assiduis adversus finitimos bellis exercendo, majori, quam quod habebat, operi præparabat. Eratque etiam eo timendus, quod, cum Germaniam ad lævam et in fronte, Pannoniam ad dextram, a tergo sedium suarum haberet Noricos, tamquam in omnes semper venturus, ab omnibus timebatur. Nec securam incrementi sui patiebatur esse Italiam: quippe cum a summis Alpium jugis, quæ finem Italiæ terminant, initium ejus finium haud multo plus CC. millibus passuum abesset. Hunc virum et hanc regionem proximo anno diversis e partibus Tib. Cæsar aggredi statuit. Sentio Saturnino mandatum, ut per Cattos, excisis continentibus Hercyniæ silvis, legiones Boiohœmum (id regioni, quam incolebat Maroboduus, nomen est) duceret; ipse a Carnunto, qui locus Norici regni proximus ab hac parte erat, exercitum, qui in Illyrico merebat, ducere in Marcomannos orsus est.

VELL. PATERC. II.

CXVII. Tantum quod ultimam imposuerat Pannonico ac Delmatico bello Cæsar manum, cum, intra quinque consummati tanti operis dies, funestæ ex Germania epistolæ, cæsi Vari, trucidatarumque legionum trium totidemque alarum, et sex cohortium: velut in hoc saltem tantummodo indulgente nobis Fortuna, ne occupato duce. Sed causa et persona moram exigit. Varus Quinctilius, nobili magis, quam illustri ortus familia, vir ingenio mitis, moribus quietus, ut corpore, ita animo immobilior, otio magis castrorum, quam bellicæ assuetus militiæ: pecuniæ vero quam non contemtor, Syria, cui præfuerat, declaravit; quam pauper divitem ingressus, dives pauperem reliquit. Is cum exercitui, qui erat in Germania, præesset, concepit esse homines, qui nihil præter vocem membraque haberent hominum; quique gladiis domari non poterant, posse jure mulceri. Quo proposito mediam ingressus Germaniam, velut inter viros pacis gaudentes dulcedine, jurisdictionibus, agendoque pro tribunali ordine, trahebat æstiva.

CXVIII. At illi, quod nisi expertus vix credat, in summa feritate versutissimi, natumque mendacio genus, simulantes fictas litium series, et nunc provocantes alter alterum inju-

ria, nunc agentes gratias, quod ea Romana justitia finiret, feritasque sua novitate incognitæ disciplinæ mitesceret, et solita armis descerni jure terminarentur, in summam socordiam perduxere Quinctilium; usque eo, ut se prætorem urbanum in foro jus dicere, non in mediis Germaniæ finibus exercitui præesse crederet. Tum juvenis genere nobilis, manu fortis, sensu celer, ultra barbarum promtus ingenio, nomine Arminius, Sigimeri principis gentis ejus filius, ardorem animi vultu oculisque præferens, assiduus militiæ nostræ prioris comes, (cum) jure etiam civitates Romanæ jus equestris consequens gradus, segnitia ducis in occasionem sceleris usus est, haud imprudenter speculatus, neminem celerius opprimi, quam qui nihil timeret; et frequentissimum initium esse calamitatis, securitatem. Primo igitur paucos, mox plures in societatem consilii recipit: opprimi posse Romanos, et dicit, et persuadet; decretis facta jungit; tempus insidiarum constituit. Id Varo per virum ejus gentis fidelem clarique nominis Segesten indicatur. Sed obstabant jam fata consiliis, omnemque animi ejus aciem præstrinxerant. Quippe ita se res habet, ut plerumque [qui] fortunam mutaturus Deus, consilia corrumpat, efficiatque, quod miserrimum est, ut, quod accidit, id etiam merito accidisse videatur, et casus in culpam transeat. Negat itaque se credere, spemque in se benevolentiæ ex merito æstimare profitetur. Nec diutius, post primum indicem, secundo relictus locus.

CXIX. Ordinem atrocissimæ calamitatis, qua nulla, post Crassi in Parthis damnum, in externis gentibus gravior Romanis fuit, justis voluminibus, ut alii, ita nos conabimur exponere. Nunc summa deflenda est. Exercitus omnium fortissimus, disciplina, manu, experientiaque bellorum inter Romanos milites princeps, marcore ducis, perfidia hostis, iniquitate fortunæ circumventus (cum ne pugnandi quidem aut egrediendi occasio iis, in quantum voluerant, data esset impune; castigatis etiam quibusdam gravi pœna, quia Romanis et armis et animis usi fuissent), inclusus silvis, paludibus, insidiis, ab eo hoste ad internecionem trucidatus est, quem semper ita more pecudum trucidaverat, ut vitam aut mortem ejus nunc ira, nunc venia temperaret. Duci plus ad moriendum, quam ad pugnandum, animi fuit. Quippe

paterni avitique exempli successor se ipse transfixit. At e præfectis castrorum duobus, quam clarum exemplum L. Eggius, tam turpe (C.) Ceionius prodidit: qui, cum longe maximam partem absumsisset acies, auctor deditionis, supplicio quam prœlio mori maluit. At Vala Numonius, legatus Vari, cetera quietus ac probus, diri auctor exempli, spoliatum equite peditem relinquens, fuga cum alis Rhenum petere ingressus est. Quod factum ejus fortuna ulta est: non enim desertis superfuit, sed desertor occidit. Vari corpus semiustum hostilis laceraverat feritas; caput ejus abscissum, latumque ad Maroboduum, et ab eo missum ad Cæsarem, gentilitii tandem tumuli sepultura honoratum est.

CXX. His auditis revolat ad patrem Cæsar; perpetuus patronus Romani imperii, assuetam sibi causam suscipit. Mittitur ad Germaniam, Gallias confirmat, disponit exercitus, præsidia munit; se magnitudine sua, non fiducia (ducis) metiens, qui Cimbricam Teutonicamque militiam Italiæ minabatur, ultro Rhenum cum exercitu transgreditur. Arma infert genti, quam arcuisse pater et patria contenti erant; penetrat interius, aperit limites, vastat agros, urit domos, fundit obvios; maximaque cum gloria, incolumi omnium, quos transduxerat, numero, in hiberna revertitur. Reddatur verum L. Asprenati testimonium; qui legatus sub avunculo suo Varo militans, nava virilique opera duarum legionum, quibus præerat, exercitum immunem tanta calamitate servavit; matureque ad inferiora hiberna descendendo, vacillantes jam cis Rhenum sitarum gentium animos confirmavit. Sunt tamen, qui, ut vivos ab eo vindicatos, ita jugulatorum sub Varo occupata crediderint patrimonia, hereditatemque excisi exercitus, in quantum voluerit, ab eo aditam. Lucii etiam Cædicii, præfecti castrorum, eorumque qui una circumdati Alisone immensis Germanorum copiis obsidebantur, laudanda virtus est; qui, omnibus difficultatibus superatis, quas inopia rerum intolerabiles, vis hostium faciebat inexsuperabiles, nec temerario consilio, nec segni providentia usi, speculatique opportunitatem, ferro sibi ad suos peperere reditum. Ex quo apparet Varum, sane gravem et bonæ voluntatis virum, magis imperatoris defectum consilio, quam virtute destitutum militum, se magnificentissimumque perdi-

disse exercitum. Cum in captivos sæviretur a Germanis, præclari facinoris auctor fuit Caldus Cœlius, adolescens vetustate familiæ suæ dignissimus: qui, complexus catenarum, quibus vinctus erat, seriem, ita illas illisit capiti [suo], ut protinus pariter sanguinis cerebrique influvio exspiraret.

CXXI. Eadem et virtus et fortuna subsequenti tempore [ingressa animum] imperatoris Tiberii fuit, quæ initio fuerat. Qui, contusis hostium viribus, classicis peditumque expeditionibus, cum res Galliarum maximæ molis, accensasque plebis Viennensium dissensiones, coercitione magis quam pœna mollisset; et senatus populusque Romanus, postulante patre ejus, ut æquum ei jus in omnibus provinciis exercitibusque esset [quam erat ipsi], decreto complexus esset. (Etenim absurdum erat, non esse sub illo, quæ ab illo vindicabantur; et qui ad opem ferendam primus erat, ad vindicandum honorem non judicare parem): in Urbem reversus, jam pridem debitum, sed continuatione bellorum dilatum, ex Pannoniis Delmatisque egit triumphum. Cujus magnificentiam quis miretur in Cæsare? Fortunæ vero quis non miretur indulgentiam? quippe omnes eminentissimos hostium duces, non occisos fama narravit, sed vinctos triumphus ostendit. Quem mihi, fratrique meo, inter præcipuos præcipuisque donis adornatos viros comitari contigit.

CXXII. Quis non inter reliqua, quibus singularis moderatio Tib. Cæsaris elucet atque eminet, hoc quoque miretur, quod, cum sine ulla dubitatione septem triumphos meruerit, tribus contentus fuerit? Quis enim dubitare potest, quin ex Armenia recepta, et ex rege ei præposito, cujus capiti insigne regium sua manu imposuerat, ordinatisque rebus Orientis, ovans triumphare debuerit? et, Vindelicorum Rhætorumque victor, curru urbem ingredi? Fractis deinde post adoptionem continua triennii militia Germaniæ viribus, idem illi honor et deferendus et recipiendus fuerit? et post cladem sub Varo acceptam, ocius prosperrimo rerum eventu eadem excisa Germania triumphum summi ducis adornare debuerit? Sed in hoc viro nescias, utrum magis mireris, quod laborum periculorumque semper excessit modum, an, quod honorem temperavit.

TACIT. ANN. I.

LV. Druso Cæsare, C. Norbano consulibus, decernitur Germanico triumphus, manente bello; quod quamquam in æstatem summa ope parabat, initio veris, et repentino in Cattos excursu, præcepit: nam spes incesserat dissidere hostem in Arminium ac Segestem, insignem utrumque perfidia in nos, aut fide. Arminius turbator Germaniæ: Segestes, "parari rebellionem" sæpe alias, et supremo convivio, post quod in arma itum, aperuit: suasitque Varo, "ut se, et Arminium, et ceteros proceres vinciret: nihil ausuram plebem, principibus amotis; atque ipsi tempus fore, quo crimina, et innoxios discerneret:" sed Varus fato, et vi Arminii cecidit. Segestes, quamquam consensu gentis in bellum tractus, discors manebat, auctis privatim odiis, quod Arminius filiam ejus, alii pactam, rapuerat; gener invisus, inimici soceri; quæque apud concordes vincula caritatis, incitamenta irarum apud infensos erant.

LVI. Igitur Germanicus quatuor legiones, quinque auxiliarium millia, et tumultuarias catervas Germanorum cis Rhenum colentium, Cæcinæ tradit: totidem legiones, duplicem sociorum numerum ipse ducit; positoque castello super vestigia paterni præsidii in monte Tauno, expeditum exercitum in Cattos rapit; L. Apronio ad munitiones viarum et fluminum relicto. Nam, rarum illi cœlo, siccitate, et amnibus modicis inoffensum iter properaverat; imbresque et fluminum auctus regredienti metuebatur. Sed Cattis adeo improvisus advenit, ut quod imbecillum ætate ac sexu, statim captum, aut trucidatum sit. Juventus flumen Adranam nando tramiserat, Romanosque pontem cœptantes arcebant: dein tormentis sagittisque pulsi, tentatis frustra conditionibus pacis, cum quidam ad Germanicum perfugissent, reliqui, omissis pagis vicisque, in silvas disperguntur. Cæsar incenso Mattio (id genti caput) aperta populatus, vertit ad Rhenum: non auso hoste terga abeuntium lacessere, quod illi moris, quotiens astu magis, quam per formidinem cessit. Fuerat animus Cheruscis juvare Cattos, sed exterruit Cæcina huc illuc ferens arma; et Marsos congredi ausos, prospero prœlio cohibuit.

LVII. Neque multo post legati a Segeste venerunt, auxilium orantes adversus vim popularium, a quis circumsede-

batur; validiore apud eos Arminio, quando bellum suadebat. Nam barbaris, quanto quis audacia promptus, tanto magis fidus, rebusque motis potior habetur. Addiderat Segestes legatis filium, nomine Segimundum: sed juvenis conscientia cunctabatur: quippe anno, quo Germaniæ descivere, sacerdos apud Aram Ubiorum creatus, ruperat vittas, profugus ad rebelles. Adductus tamen in spem clementiæ Romanæ, pertulit patris mandata, benigneque exceptus cum præsidio Gallicam in ripam missus est. Germanico pretium fuit, convertere agmen: pugnatumque in obsidentes, et ereptus Segestes magna cum propinquorum et clientium manu. Inerant feminæ nobiles, inter quas uxor Arminii, eademque filia Segestis, mariti magis quam parentis animo, neque victa in lacrimas, neque voce supplex, compressis intra sinum manibus, gravidum uterum intuens. Ferebantur et spolia Varianæ cladis, plerisque eorum, qui tum in deditionem veniebant, prædæ data. Simul Segestes ipse ingens visu, et memoria bonæ societatis impavidus: verba ejus in hunc modum fuere.

LVIII. "Non hic mihi primus erga populum Romanum fidei et constantiæ dies: ex quo a divo Augusto civitate donatus sum, amicos inimicosque ex vestris utilitatibus delegi: neque odio patriæ (quippe proditores, etiam iis quos anteponunt, invisi sunt), verum quia Romanis Germanisque idem conducere; et pacem, quam bellum probabam. Ergo raptorem filiæ meæ, violatorem fœderis vestri Arminium, apud Varum, qui tum exercitui præsidebat, reum feci: dilatus segnitia ducis, quia parum præsidii in legibus erat, ut me, et Arminium, et conscios vinciret, flagitavi. Testis illa nox, mihi utinam potius novissima! Quæ secuta sunt, defleri magis, quam defendi possunt: ceterum et injeci catenas Arminio, et a factione ejus injectas perpessus sum. Atque ubi primum tui copia, vetera novis, et quieta turbidis antehabeo: neque ob præmium, sed ut me perfidia exsolvam; simul genti Germanorum idoneus conciliator, si pœnitentiam quam perniciem maluerit. Pro juventa et errore filii veniam precor: filiam necessitate huc adductam fateor: tuum erit consultare, utrum prævaleat, quod ex Arminio concepit, an quod ex me genita est." Cæsar, clementi responso, liberis propinquisque ejus incolumitatem, ipsi sedem Vetera, in pro-

vincia, pollicetur. Exercitum reduxit, nomenque imperatoris auctore Tiberio accepit. Arminii uxor, virilis sexus stirpem edidit: educatus Ravennæ puer, quo mox ludibrio conflictatus sit, in tempore memorabo.

LIX. Fama dediti benigneque excepti Segestis vulgata, ut quibusque bellum invitis aut cupientibus erat, spe vel dolore accipitur. Arminium, super insitam violentiam, rapta uxor, subjectus servitio uxoris uterus, vecordem agebant: volitabatque per Cheruscos, arma in Segestem, arma in Cæsarem poscens: neque probris temperabat. "Egregium patrem! magnum imperatorem! fortem exercitum! quorum tot manus unam mulierculam avexerint. Sibi tres legiones, totidem legatos procubuisse. Non enim se proditione, neque adversus feminas gravidas, sed palam adversus armatos bellum tractare: cerni adhuc Germanorum in lucis signa Romana, quæ diis patriis suspenderit: coleret Segestes victam ripam; redderet filio sacerdotium: hominem Germanos numquam satis excusaturos, quod inter Albim et Rhenum virgas, et secures, et togam viderint. Aliis gentibus, ignorantia imperii Romani, inexperta esse supplicia, nescia tributa: quæ quando exuerint, inritusque discesserit ille inter numina dicatus Augustus, ille delectus Tiberius, ne imperitum adolescentulum, ne seditiosum exercitum pavescerent. Si patriam, parentes, antiqua mallent, quàm dominos, et colonias novas; Arminium potius gloriæ ac libertatis, quam Segestem flagitiosæ servitutis ducem sequerentur."

LX. Conciti per hæc non modo Cherusci, sed conterminæ gentes; tractusque in partes Inguiomerus Arminii patruus, veteri apud Romanos auctoritate: unde major Cæsari metus: et ne bellum mole una ingrueret, Cæcinam cum quadraginta cohortibus Romanis, distrahendo hosti, per Bructeros ad flumen Amisiam mittit: equitem Pedo præfectus, finibus Frisiorum ducit: ipse impositas navibus quatuor legiones per lacus vexit: simulque pedes, eques, classis, apud prædictum amnem convenere. Chauci cum auxilia pollicerentur, in commilitium adsciti sunt. Bructeros sua urentes, expedita cum manu L. Stertinius, missu Germanici fudit, interque cædem et prædam reperit undevicesimæ legionis aquilam cum Varo amissam. Ductum inde agmen ad ultimos Bructerorum:

quantumque Amisiam et Luppiam amnes inter, vastatum; haud procul Teutoburgiensi saltu, in quo reliquiæ Vari legionumque insepultæ dicebantur.

LXI. Igitur cupido Cæsarem invadit solvendi suprema militibus, ducique; permoto ad miserationem omni, qui aderat, exercitu, ob propinquos, amicos, denique ob casus bellorum et sortem hominum. Præmisso Cæcina, ut occulta saltuum scrutaretur, pontesque et aggeres humido paludum et fallacibus campis imponeret, incedunt mœstos locos, visuque ac memoria deformes. Prima Vari castra, lato ambitu, et dimensis principiis, trium legionum manus ostentabant: dein semiruto vallo, humili fossa, accisæ jam reliquiæ consedisse intelligebantur: medio campi albentia ossa, ut fugerant, ut restiterant, disjecta vel aggerata: adjacebant fragmina telorum, equorumque artus, simul truncis arborum antefixa ora; lucis propinquis barbaræ aræ, apud quas tribunos, ac primorum ordinum centuriones mactaverant: et cladis ejus superstites pugnam aut vincula elapsi, referebant, "hic cecidisse legatos; illic raptas aquilas; primum ubi vulnus Varo adactum; ubi infelici dextra, et suo ictu mortem invenerit: quo tribunali concionatus Arminius; quot patibula captivis, quæ scrobes; utque signis et aquilis per superbiam inluserit."

LXII. Igitur Romanus, qui aderat, exercitus, sextum post cladis annum, trium legionum ossa, nullo noscente alienas reliquias an suorum humo tegeret, omnes ut conjunctos, ut consanguineos, aucta in hostem ira, mœsti simul et infensi condebant. Primum exstruendo tumulo cespitem Cæsar posuit, gratissimo munere in defunctos, et præsentibus doloris socius. Quod Tiberio haud probatum; seu cuncta Germanici in deterius trahenti; sive exercitum imagine cæsorum insepultorumque tardatum ad prœlia, et formidolosiorem hostium credebat: "neque imperatorem auguratu et vetustissimis cærimoniis præditum, adtrectare feralia debuisse."

LXIII. Sed Germanicus cedentem in avia Arminium secutus, ubi primum copia fuit, evehi equites, campumque, quem hostis insederat, eripi jubet. Arminius colligi suos, et propinquare silvis monitos, vertit repente; mox signum prorumpendi dedit iis, quos per saltus occultaverat. Tunc nova acie turbatus eques, missæque subsidiariæ cohortes, et fugien-

tium agmine impulsæ, auxerant consternationem: trudebanturque in paludem gnaram vincentibus, iniquam nesciis, ni Cæsar productas legiones instruxisset: inde hostibus terror, fiducia militi: et manibus æquis abscessum. Mox reducto ad Amisiam exercitu, legiones classe, ut advexerat, reportat. Pars equitum litore Oceani petere Rhenum jussa. Cæcina, qui suum militem ducebat, monitus, quamquam notis itineribus regrederetur, pontes longos quam maturrime superare. Angustus is trames, vastas inter paludes, et quondam a L. Domitio aggeratus: cetera limosa, tenacia gravi cœno, aut rivis incerta erant: circum silvæ paullatim adclives; quas tum Arminius implevit, compendiis viarum, et cito agmine, onustum sarcinis armisque militem cum antevenisset. Cæcinæ, dubitanti quonam modo ruptos vetustate pontes reponeret, simulque propulsaret hostem, castrametari in loco placuit; ut opus, et alii prœlium inciperent.

LXIV. Barbari perfringere stationes, seque inferre munitoribus nisi, lacessunt, circumgrediuntur, occursant: miscetur operantium bellantiumque clamor: et cuncta pariter Romanis adversa; locus uligine profunda, idem ad gradum instabilis, procedentibus lubricus; corpora gravia loricis, neque librare pila inter undas poterant. Contra Cheruscis sueta apud paludes prœlia, procera membra, hastæ ingentes ad vulnera facienda, quamvis procul: nox demum inclinantes tum legiones adversæ pugnæ exemit. Germani ob prospera indefessi, ne tum quidem sumpta quiete, quantum aquarum circumsurgentibus jugis oritur, vertere in subjecta: mersaque humo, et obruto quod effectum operis, duplicatus militi labor. Quadragesimum id stipendium Cæcina parendi aut imperitandi habebat: secundarum ambiguarumque rerum sciens, eoque interritus. Igitur futura volvens, non aliud reperit, quam ut hostem silvis coerceret, donec saucii, quantumque gravioris agminis, anteirent: nam medio montium et paludum porrigebatur planicies, quæ tenuem aciem pateretur. Deliguntur legiones, quinta dextro lateri; unaetvicesima in lævum; primani ducendum ad agmen; vicesimanus adversum secuturos.

LXV. Nox per diversa inquies: cum barbari festis epulis, læto cantu, aut truci sonore subjecta vallium ac resultantes saltus complerent; apud Romanos invalidi ignes, interruptæ

voces, atque ipsi passim adjacerent vallo, oberrarent tentoriis, insomnes magis quam pervigiles. Ducemque terruit dira quies: nam Quinctilium Varum sanguine oblitum, et paludibus emersum, cernere et audire visus est, velut vocantem, non tamen obsecutus, et manum intendentis repulisse. Cœpta luce, missæ in latera legiones metu, an contumacia, locum deseruere: capto propere campo, humentia ultra. Neque tamen Arminius, quamquam libero incursu, statim prorupit: sed ut hæsere cœno fossisque impedimenta, turbati circum milites, incertus signorum ordo, utque tali in tempore sibi quisque properus, et lentæ adversum imperia aures, irrumpere Germanos jubet, clamitans, "En Varus, et eodem iterum fato victæ legiones!" Simul hæc; et cum delectis scindit agmen, equisque maxime vulnera ingerit: illi sanguine suo, et lubrico paludum lapsentes, excussis rectoribus disjicere obvios, proterere jacentes: plurimus circa aquilas labor, quæ neque adversum ferri ingruentia tela, neque figi limosa humo poterant. Cæcina dum sustentat aciem, suffosso equo delapsus circumveniebatur, ni prima legio sese opposuisset: juvit hostium aviditas, omissa cæde, prædam sectantium; enisæque legiones, vesperascente die, in aperta et solida: neque is miseriarum finis: struendum vallum, petendus agger: amissa magna ex parte, per quæ egeritur humus, aut exciditur cespes: non tentoria manipulis, non fomenta sauciis: infectos cœno aut cruore cibos dividentes, funestas tenebras, et tot hominum millibus unum jam reliquum diem lamentabantur.

LXVI. Forte equus abruptis vinculis vagus, et clamore territus, quosdam occurrentium obturbavit: tanta inde consternatio inrupisse Germanos credentium, ut cuncti ruerent ad portas; quarum Decumana maxime petebatur, aversa hosti, et fugientibus tutior. Cæcina, comperto vanam esse formidinem, cum tamen neque auctoritate, neque precibus, ne manu quidem obsistere, aut retinere militem quiret; projectus in limine portæ, miseratione demum, quia per corpus legati eundum erat, clausit viam: simul tribuni et centuriones falsum pavorem docuerunt.

LXVII. Tunc contractos in principia, jussosque dicta cum silentio accipere, temporis ac necessitatis monet. "Unam in armis salutem, sed ea consilio temperanda: manendumque

intra vallum, donec expugnandi hostes spe, propius succederent: mox undique erumpendum: illa eruptione ad Rhenum perveniri: quod si fugerent, plures silvas, profundas magis paludes, sævitiam hostium superesse: at victoribus decus, gloriam: quæ domi cara, quæ in castris honesta," memorat: reticuit de adversis. Equos dehinc, orsus a suis, legatorum tribunorumque nulla ambitione, fortissimo cuique bellatori tradit, ut hi, mox pedes, in hostem invaderent.

LXVIII. Haud minus inquies Germanus, spe, cupidine, et diversis ducum sententiis agebat: Arminio, "sinerent egredi, egressosque rursum per humida et impedita circumvenirent," suadente: atrociora Inguiomero, et læta barbaris, "ut vallum armis ambirent: promptam expugnationem, plures captivos, incorruptam prædam fore." Igitur orta die, proruunt fossas, injiciunt crates, summa valli prensant, raro super milite, et quasi ob metum defixo. Postquam hæsere munimentis, datur cohortibus signum, cornuaque ac tubæ concinuere: exin clamore et impetu tergis Germanorum circumfunduntur exprobrantes, "non hic silvas, nec paludes, sed æquis locis æquos deos." Hosti, facile excidium, et paucos et semermos cogitanti, sonus tubarum, fulgor armorum, quanto inopina, tanto majora offunduntur; cadebantque, ut rebus secundis avidi, ita adversis incauti. Arminius integer, Inguiomerus post grave vulnus, pugnam deseruere; vulgus trucidatum est, donec ira et dies permansit. Nocte demum reversæ legiones, quamvis plus vulnerum, eadem ciborum egestas fatigaret, vim, sanitatem, copias, cuncta in victoria habuere.

LXIX. Pervaserat interim "circumventi exercitus" fama, et "infesto Germanorum agmine Gallias peti:" ac ni Agrippina impositum Rheno pontem solvi prohibuisset, erant qui id flagitium formidine auderent: sed femina ingens animi, munia ducis per eos dies induit, militibusque ut quis inops, aut saucius, vestem et fomenta dilargita est. Tradit C. Plinius, Germanicorum bellorum scriptor, stetisse apud principium pontis, laudes et grates reversis legionibus habentem. Id Tiberii animum altius penetravit. "Non enim simplices eas curas: nec adversus externos militem quæri: nihil relictum imperatoribus, ubi femina manipulos intervisat, signa

adeat, largitionem tentet, tamquam parum ambitiose filium ducis gregali habitu circumferat. Cæsaremque Caligulam appellari velit. Potiorem jam apud exercitus Agrippinam, quam legatos, quam duces: compressam a muliere seditionem, cui nomen principis obsistere non quiverit." Accendebat hæc onerabatque Sejanus, peritia morum Tiberii, odia in longum jaciens, quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret.

LXX. At Germanicus legionum, quas navibus vexerat, secundam et quartamdecimam itinere terrestri P. Vitellio ducendas tradit, quo levior classis vadoso mari innaret, vel reciproco sideret. Vitellius primum iter sicca humo, aut modice adlabente æstu, quietum habuit. Mox impulsu aquilonis, simul sidere æquinoctii, quo maxime tumescit Oceanus, rapi agique agmen: et opplebantur terræ: eadem freto, litori, campis facies: neque discerni poterant incerta ab solidis, brevia a profundis. Sternuntur fluctibus, hauriuntur gurgitibus: jumenta, sarcinæ, corpora exanima interfluunt, occursant: permiscentur inter se manipuli, modo pectore, modo ore tenus exstantes, aliquando subtracto solo disjecti aut obruti: non vox, et mutui hortatus juvabant, adversante unda: nihil strenuus ab ignavo, sapiens ab imprudenti, consilia a casu differre: cuncta pari violentia involvebantur. Tandem Vitellius in editiora enisus, eodem agmen subduxit: pernoctavere sine utensilibus, sine igni, magna pars nudo aut mulcato corpore, haud minus miserabiles, quam quos hostis circumsidet: quippe illis etiam honestæ mortis usus, his inglorium exitium: lux reddidit terram; penetratumque ad amnem Unsingin, quo Cæsar classe contenderat: impositæ deinde legiones, vagante fama submersas; nec fides salutis, antequam Cæsarem exercitumque reducem videre.

LXXI. Jam Stertinius ad accipiendum in deditionem Segimerum fratrem Segestis præmissus, ipsum et filium ejus in civitatem Ubiorum perduxerat: data utrique venia, facile Segimero, cunctantius filio: quia Quinctilii Vari corpus inlusisse dicebatur. Ceterum ad supplenda exercitus damna certavere Galliæ, Hispaniæ, Italia; quod cuique promptum, arma, equos, aurum offerentes: quorum laudato studio Germanicus, armis modo et equis ad bellum sumptis, propria pecunia militem juvit. Utque cladis memoriam etiam comi-

tate leniret, circumire saucios; facta singulorum extollere; vulnera intuens, alium spe, alium gloria, cunctos alloquio et cura, sibique et prœlio firmabat.

TACIT. ANN. II.

V. Ceterum Tiberio haud ingratum accidit turbari res Orientis, ut ea specie Germanicum suetis legionibus abstraheret; novisque provinciis impositum, dolo simul et casibus objectaret. At ille, quanto acriora in eum studia militum, et aversa patrui voluntas, celerandæ victoriæ intentior, tractare prœliorum vias, et quæ sibi tertium jam annum belligeranti sæva vel prospera evenissent: "fundi Germanos acie et justis locis; juvari silvis, paludibus, brevi æstate, et præmatura hieme: suum militem haud perinde vulneribus, quam spatiis itinerum, damno armorum adfici: fessas Gallias ministrandis equis: longum impedimentorum agmen, opportunum ad insidias, defensantibus iniquum. At si mare intretur, promptam ipsis possessionem, et hostibus ignotam: simul bellum maturius incipi, legionesque et commeatus pariter vehi: integrum equitem, equosque, per ora et alveos fluminum media in Germania fore."

VI. Igitur huc intendit: missis ad census Galliarum, P. Vitellio et C. Antio; Silius, et Anteius, et Cæcina fabricandæ classi præponuntur. Mille naves sufficere visæ, properatæque: aliæ breves, angusta puppi proraque, et lato utero, quo facilius fluctos tolerarent: quædam planæ carinis, ut sine noxa siderent: plures, adpositis utrimque gubernaculis, converso ut repente remigio, hinc vel illinc adpellerent: multæ pontibus stratæ, super quas tormenta veherentur, simul aptæ ferendis equis aut commeatui, velis habiles, citæ remis, augebantur alacritate militum in speciem ac terrorem. Insula Batavorum in quam convenirent prædicta, ob faciles adpulsus, accipiendisque copiis, et transmittendum ad bellum opportuna. Nam Rhenus uno alveo continuus, aut modicas insulas circumveniens, apud principium agri Batavi, velut in duos amnes dividitur, servatque nomen et violentiam cursus, qua Germaniam prævehitur, donec Oceano misceatur: ad Gallicam ripam latior et placidior adfluens, verso cognomento Vahalem accolæ dicunt: mox id quoque vocabulum mutat Mosa

flumine, ejusque immenso ore eundem in Oceanum effunditur.

VII. Sed Cæsar, dum adiguntur naves, Silium legatum cum expedita manu inruptionem in Cattos facere jubet: ipse, audito castellum Luppiæ flumini adpositum obsideri, sex legiones eo duxit. Neque Silio ob subitos imbres aliud actum, quam ut modicam prædam, et Arpi principis Cattorum conjugem filiamque raperet: neque Cæsari copiam pugnæ obsessores fecere, ad famam adventus ejus dilapsi. Tumulum tamen nuper Varianis legionibus structum, et veterem aram Druso sitam disjecerant: restituit aram; honorique patris princeps ipse cum legionibus decucurrit. Tumulum iterare haud visum: et cuncta inter castellum Alisonem, ac Rhenum, novis limitibus, aggeribusque permunita.

VIII. Jamque classis advenerat, cum præmisso commeatu, et distributis in legiones ac socios navibus, fossam, cui Drusianæ nomen, ingressus, precatusque Drusum patrem, "ut se eadem ausum, libens placatusque exemplo ac memoria consiliorum atque operum juvaret:" lacus inde et Oceanum usque ad Amisiam flumen secunda navigatione pervehitur: classis Amisiæ relicta, lævo amne; erratumque in eo, quod non subvexit: transposuit militem dextras in terras iturum: ita plures dies efficiendis pontibus absumpti. Et eques quidem ac legiones prima æstuaria, nondum adcrescente unda, intrepidi transiere: postremum auxiliorum agmen, Batavique in parte ea, dum insultant aquis, artemque nandi ostentant, turbati, et quidam hausti sunt. Metanti castra Cæsari Angrivariorum defectio a tergo nuntiatur: missus illico Stertinius cum equite et armatura levi, igne et cædibus perfidiam ultus est.

IX. Flumen Visurgis Romanos Cheruscosque interfluebat: ejus in ripa cum ceteris primoribus Arminius adstitit, quæsitoque "an Cæsar venisset?" postquam "adesse" responsum est, "ut liceret cum fratre conloqui" oravit. Erat is in exercitu cognomento Flavius, insignis fide, et amisso per vulnus oculo paucis ante annis, duce Tiberio: tam permissum; progressusque salutatur ab Arminio: qui amotis stipatoribus; "ut sagittarii nostra pro ripa dispositi abscederent," postulat; et postquam digressi, "unde ea deformitas oris?" interrogat

fratrem: illo locum, et prœlium referente, "quodnam præmium recepisset" exquirit. Flavius "aucta stipendia, torquem, et coronam, aliaque militaria dona" memorat, inridente Arminio vilia servitii pretia.

X. Exin diversi ordiuntur: hic "magnitudinem Romanam, opes Cæsaris, et victis graves pœnas; in deditionem venienti paratam clementiam; neque conjugem et filium ejus hostiliter haberi." Ille "fas patriæ, libertatem avitam, penetrales Germaniæ deos, matrem precum sociam; ne propinquorum et adfinium, denique gentis suæ desertor et proditor, quam imperator esse mallet." Paullatim inde ad jurgia prolapsi, quominus pugnam consererent, ne flumine quidem interjecto cohibebantur; ne Stertinius adcurrens, plenum iræ, "armaque et equum" poscentem Flavium attinuisset. Cernebatur contra minitabundus Arminius, prœliumque denuntians: nam pleraque Latino sermone interjaciebat, ut qui Romanis in castris ductor popularium meruisset.

XI. Postero die, Germanorum acies trans Visurgim stetit. Cæsar, nisi pontibus præsidiisque impositis, dare in discrimen legiones haud imperatorium ratus, equitem vado tramittit: præfuere Stertinius, et e numero primipilarium Æmilius, distantibus locis invecti, ut hostem diducerent. Qua celerrimus amnis, Cariovalda dux Batavorum erupit: eum Cherusci fugam simulantes, in planitiem saltibus circumjectam traxere: dein coorti, et undique effusi trudunt adversos, instant cedentibus, collectosque in orbem, pars congressi, quidam eminus proturbant. Cariovalda, diu sustentata hostium sævitia, hortatus suos ut ingruentes catervas globo frangerent, atque ipse in densissimos inrumpens, congestis telis et suffosso equo labitur, ac multi nobilium circa: ceteros vis sua, aut equites cum Stertinio Æmilioque subvenientes, periculo exemere.

XII. Cæsar transgressus Visurgim, indicio perfugæ cognoscit, "delectum ab Arminio locum pugnæ; convenisse et alias nationes in silvam Herculi sacram, ausurosque nocturnam castrorum oppugnationem." Habita indici fides, et cernebantur ignes; suggressique propius speculatores "audiri fremitum equorum, immensique et inconditi agminis murmur" attulere. Igitur propinquo summæ rei discrimine, explo-

randos militum animos ratus, quonam id modo incorruptum foret, secum agitabat: "Tribunos et centuriones læta sæpius quam comperta nuntiare; libertorum servilia ingenia; amicis inesse adulationem: si concio vocetur, illic quoque, quæ pauci incipiant, reliquos adstrepere: penitus noscendas mentes, cum secreti et incustoditi, inter militares cibos, spem aut metum proferrent."

XIII. Nocte cœpta, egressus augurali, per occulta et vigilibus ignara, comite uno, contectus humeros ferina pelle, adit castrorum vias, adsistit tabernaculis, fruiturque fama sui: cum hic "nobilitatem ducis," "decorem" alius, plurimi "patientiam, comitatem, per seria, per jocos eumdem animum," laudibus ferrent: "reddendamque gratiam in acie" faterentur: simul "perfidos et ruptores pacis, ultioni et gloriæ mactandos." Inter quæ unus hostium Latinæ linguæ sciens, acto ad vallum equo, voce magna, "conjuges, et agros, et stipendii in dies, donec bellaretur, sestertios centenos, si quis transfugisset," Arminii nomine pollicetur. Incendit ea contumelia legionum iras: "veniret dies, daretur pugna: sumpturum militem Germanorum agros, tracturum conjuges: accipere omen, et matrimonia ac pecunias hostium prædæ destinare." Tertia ferme vigilia adsultatum est castris, sine conjectu teli, postquam crebras pro munimentis cohortes, et nihil remissum sensere.

XIV. Nox eadem lætam Germanico quietem tulit, viditque se operatum, et sanguine sacro respersa prætexta, pulchriorem aliam manibus aviæ Augustæ accepisse. Auctus omine, addicentibus auspiciis, vocat concionem, et quæ sapientia prævisa, aptaque imminenti pugnæ, disserit. "Non compos modo militi Romano ad prœlium bonos, sed si ratio adsit, silvas et saltus: nec enim immensa barbarorum scuta, enormes hastas, inter truncos arborum, et enata humo virgulta, perinde haberi quam pila, et gladios, et hærentia corpori tegmina: densarent ictus, ora mucronibus quærerent: non loricam Germano, non galeam; ne scuta quidem ferro nervove firmata, sed viminum textus, vel tenues et fucatas colore tabulas: primam utcumque aciem hastatam; ceteris, præusta aut brevia tela: jam corpus, ut visu torvum, et ad brevem impetum validum, sic nulla vulnerum patientia: sine

pudore flagitii, sine cura ducum, abire, fugere; pavidos adversis; inter secunda, non divini, non humani juris memores. Si tædio viarum ac maris finem cupiant, hac acie parari: propiorem jam Albim, quam Rhenum: neque bellum ultra, modo se patris patruique vestigia prementem, iisdem in terris victorem sisterent." Orationem ducis secutus militum ardor; signumque pugnæ datum.

XV. Nec Arminius, aut ceteri Germanorum proceres omittebant suos quisque testari: "Hos esse Romanos Variani exercitus fugacissimos, qui ne bellum tolerarent, seditionem induerint: quorum pars onusta vulneribus tergum, pars fluctibus et procellis fractos artus, infensis rursum hostibus, adversis diis, objiciant, nulla boni spe. Classem quippe et avia Oceani quæsita, ne quis venientibus occurreret, ne pulsos premeret: sed ubi miscuerint manus, inane victis ventorum remorumque subsidium. Meminissent modo avaritiæ, crudelitatis, superbiæ: aliud sibi reliquum, quam tenere libertatem, aut mori ante servitium?"

XVI. Sic accensos et prœlium poscentes in campum, cui Idistaviso nomen, deducunt: is medius inter Visurgim et colles, ut ripæ fluminis cedunt, aut prominentia montium resistunt, inæqualiter sinuatur: pone tergum insurgebat silva, editis in altum ramis, et pura humo inter arborum truncos. Campum et prima silvarum, barbara acies tenuit: soli Cherusci juga insedere, ut prœliantibus Romanis desuper incurrerent. Noster exercitus sic incessit: auxiliares Galli, Germanique in fronte: post quos pedites sagittarii: dein quatuor legiones, et cum duabus prætoriis cohortibus, ac delecto equite Cæsar: exin totidem aliæ legiones, et levis armatura cum equite sagittario, ceteræque sociorum cohortes. Intentus paratusque miles, ut ordo agminis in aciem adsisteret.

XVII. Visis Cheruscorum catervis, quæ per ferociam proruperant, validissimos equitum incurrere latus, Stertinium cum ceteris turmis circumgredi, tergaque invadere jubet, ipse in tempore adfuturus. Interea pulcherrimum augurium, octo aquilæ petere silvas, et intrare visæ, imperatorem advertere: exclamat, "Irent, sequerentur Romanas aves, propria legionum numina." Simul pedestris acies infertur; et præmissus eques, postremos ac latera impulit. Mirumque dictu, duo

hostium agmina diversa fuga, qui silvam tenuerant, in aperta, qui campis adstiterant, in silvam ruebant: medii inter hos Cherusci, collibus detrudebantur: inter quos insignis Arminius manu, voce, vulnere, sustentabat pugnam: incubueratque sagittariis, illa rupturus, ni Rhætorum Vindelicorumque, et Gallicæ cohortes signa objecissent: nisu tamen corporis, et impetu equi pervasit, oblitus faciem suo cruore, ne nosceretur: quidam "agnitum a Chaucis inter auxilia Romana agentibus, emissumque" tradiderunt. Virtus, seu fraus eadem, Inguiomero effugium dedit: ceteri passim trucidati. Et plerosque tranare Visurgim conantes, injecta tela aut vis fluminis postremo moles ruentium, et incidentes ripæ, operuere. Quidam turpi fuga in summa arborum nisi, ramisque se occultantes, admotis sagittariis per ludibrium figebantur: alios prorutæ arbores adflixere. Magna ea victoria, neque cruenta nobis fuit.

XVIII. Quinta ab hora diei ad noctem cæsi hostes, decem millia passuum cadaveribus atque armis opplevere; repertis inter spolia eorum catenis, quas in Romanos, ut non dubio eventu, portaverant. Miles in loco prœlii, Tiberium Imperatorem salutavit, struxitque aggerem, et in modum trophæorum arma, subscriptis victarum gentium nominibus, imposuit.

XIX. Haud perinde Germanos vulnera, luctus, excidia, quam ea species dolore et ira adfecit: qui modo abire sedibus, trans Albim concedere parabant, pugnam volunt, arma rapiunt: plebes, primores, juventus, senes, agmen Romanum repente incursant, turbant: postremo deligunt locum, flumine et silvis clausum, arcta intus planitie, et humida: silvas quoque profunda palus ambibat, nisi quod latus unum Angrivarii lato aggere extulerant, quo a Cheruscis dirimerentur: hic pedes adstitit; equitem propinquis lucis texêre, ut ingressis silvam legionibus a tergo foret.

XX. Nihil ex iis Cæsari incognitum: consilia, locos, prompta, occulta noverat, astusque hostium in perniciem ipsis vertebat. Seio Tuberoni legato tradit equitem, campumque: peditum aciem ita instruxit, ut pars æquo in silvam aditu incederet, pars objectum aggerem eniteretur: quod arduum, sibi; cetera legatis permisit. Quibus plana evenerant, facile

inrupere: quis impugnandus agger, ut si murum succederent, gravibus superne ictibus conflictabantur. Sensit dux imparem cominus pugnam, remotisque paullum legionibus, funditores libratoresque excutere tela, et proturbare hostem jubet: missæ e tormentis hastæ, quantoque conspicui magis propugnatores, tanto pluribus vulneribus dejecti. Primus Cæsar cum prætoriis cohortibus, capto vallo, dedit impetum in silvas: conlato illic gradu certatum: hostem a tergo palus, Romanos flumen aut montes claudebant: utrisque necessitas in loco, spes in virtute, salus ex victoria.

XXI. Nec minor Germanis animus, sed genere pugnæ et armorum superabantur; cum ingens multitudo, arctis locis, prælongas hastas non protenderet, non colligeret, neque adsultibus et velocitate corporum uteretur, coacta stabile ad prœlium: contra miles, cui scutum pectori adpressum, et insidens capulo manus, latos barbarorum artus, nuda ora foderet, viamque strage hostium aperiret: imprompto jam Arminio, ob continua pericula, sive illum recens acceptum vulnus tardaverat. Quin et Inguiomerum tota volitantem acie, fortuna magis quam virtus deserebat: et Germanicus, quo magis adgnosceretur, detraxerat tegimen capiti, orabatque "insisterent cædibus, nil opus captivis, solam internecionem gentis finem bello fore." Jamque sero diei subducit ex acie legionem, faciendis castris: ceteræ ad noctem cruore hostium satiatæ sunt: equites ambigue certavere.

XXII. Laudatis pro concione victoribus, Cæsar congeriem armorum struxit, superbo cum titulo: DEBELLATIS INTER RHENUM ALBIMQUE NATIONIBUS EXERCITUM TIBERII CÆSARIS EA MONIMENTA MARTI ET JOVI ET AUGUSTO SACRAVISSE: de se nihil addidit, metu invidiæ, an ratus conscientiam factis satis esse. Mox bellum in Angrivarios Stertinio mandat, ni deditionem properavissent: atque illi supplices, nihil abnuendo, veniam omnium accepere.

XXIII. Sed æstate jam adulta, legionum aliæ itinere terrestri in hibernacula remissæ: plures Cæsar classi impositas per flumen Amisiam Oceano invexit. Ac primo placidum æquor mille navium remis strepere, aut velis impelli: mox atro nubium globo effusa grando: simul variis undique procellis, incerti fluctus prospectum adimere, regimen impe-

dire: milesque pavidus, et casuum maris ignarus, dum turbat nautas, vel intempestive juvat, officia prudentium corrumpebat: omne dehinc cœlum, et mare omne in austrum cessit, qui tumidis Germaniæ terris, profundis amnibus, immenso nubium tractu validus, et rigore vicini septemtrionis horridior, rapuit disjecitque naves in aperta Oceani, aut insulas saxis abruptis, vel per occulta vada infestas. Quibus paullum ægreque vitatis, postquam mutabat æstus, eodemque quo ventus ferebat; non adhærere anchoris, non exhaurire inrumpentes undas poterant: equi, jumenta, sarcinæ, etiam arma præcipitantur, quo levarentur alvei manantes per latera, et fluctu superurgente.

XXIV. Quanto violentior cetero mari Oceanus, et truculentia cœli præstat Germania, tantum illa clades novitate et magnitudine excessit, hostilibus circum litoribus, aut ita vasto et profundo, ut credatur novissimum ac sine terris mare: pars navium haustæ sunt; plures, apud insulas longius sitas ejectæ: milesque nullo illic hominum cultu, fame absumptus, nisi quos corpora equorum eodem elisa toleraverant. Sola Germanici triremis Chaucorum terram adpulit; quem per omnes illos dies noctesque, apud scopulos et prominentes oras, cum "se tanti exitii reum" clamitaret, vix cohibuere amici, quominus eodem mari oppeteret. Tandem relabente æstu, et secundante vento, claudæ naves, raro remigio, aut intentis vestibus, et quædam a validioribus tractæ, revertere: quas raptim refectas misit, ut scrutarentur insulas: collecti ea cura plerique: multos Angrivarii nuper in fidem accepti, redemptos ab interioribus reddidere: quidam in Britanniam rapti, et remissi a regulis. Ut quis ex longinquo revenerat, "miracula" narrabant, "vim turbinum, et inauditas volucres, monstra maris, ambiguas hominum et belluarum formas:" visa, sive ex metu credita.

XXV. Sed fama classis amissæ, ut Germanos ad spem belli, ita Cæsarem ad coercendum erexit. C. Silio cum triginta peditum, tribus equitum millibus ire in Cattos imperat: ipse majoribus copiis Marsos inrumpit: quorum dux Malovendus nuper in deditionem acceptus, "propinquo luco defossam Varianæ legionis aquilam modico præsidio servari" indicat. Missa extemplo manus, quæ hostem a fronte eli-

ceret, alii qui terga circumgressi recluderent humum: et utrisque adfuit fortuna. Eo promptior Cæsar pergit introrsus, populatur, exscindit non ausum congredi hostem: aut sicubi restiterat, statim pulsum, nec umquam magis, ut ex captivis cognitum est, paventem. Quippe "invictos et nullis casibus superabiles Romanos" prædicabant, "qui perdita classe, amissis armis, post constrata equorum virorumque corporibus litora, eadem virtute, pari ferocia, et veluti aucti numero inrupissent."

XXVI. Reductus inde in hiberna miles, lætus animi, quod adversa maris, expeditione prospera pensavisset: addidit munificentiam Cæsar, quantum quis damni professus erat, exsolvendo. Nec dubium habebatur, labare hostes, petendæque pacis consilia sumere, et si proxima æstas adjiceretur, posse bellum patrari: sed crebris epistolis Tiberius monebat, "rediret ad decretum triumphum: satis jam eventuum, satis casuum: prospera illi et magna prœlia: eorum quoque meminisset, quæ venti et fluctus, nulla ducis culpa, gravia tamen et sæva damna intulissent: se novies a divo Augusto in Germaniam missum, plura consilio quam vi perfecisse. Sic Sugambros in deditionem acceptos, sic Suevos, regemque Maroboduum, pace obstrictum: posse et Cheruscos, ceterasque rebellium gentes, quando Romanæ ultioni consultum esset, internis discordiis relinqui." Precante Germanico annum efficiendis cœptis, acrius modestiam ejus adgreditur, alterum consulatum offerendo, cujus munia præsens obiret: simul adnectebat, "si foret adhuc bellandum, relinqueret materiem Drusi fratris gloriæ, qui nullo tum alio hoste, nonnisi apud Germanias adsequi nomen imperatorium, et deportare lauream posset." Haud cunctatus est ultra Germanicus, quamquam fingi ea seque per invidiam parto jam decori abstrahi intelligeret.

TAC. ANN. II.

XLIV. Nec multo post Drusus in Illyricum missus est, ut suesceret militiæ, studiaque exercitus pararet; simul juvenem urbano luxu lascivientem melius in castris haberi Tiberius, seque tutiorem rebatur, utroque filio legiones obtinente. Sed Suevi prætendebantur, auxilium adversus Che-

ruscos orantes: nam discessu Romanorum, ac vacui externo metu, gentis adsuetudine, tum et æmulatione gloriæ, arma in se verterant: vis nationum, virtus ducum in æquo: sed Maroboduum regis nomen invisum apud populares; Arminium pro libertate bellantem favor habebat.

XLV. Igitur non modo Cherusci sociique eorum, vetus Arminii miles, sumpsere bellum: sed e regno etiam Marobodui Suevæ gentes, Semnones ac Langobardi, defecere ad eum: quibus additis præpollebat, ni Inguiomerus cum manu clientium ad Maroboduum perfugisset; non aliam ob causam, quam quia fratris filio juveni, patruus senex parere dedignabatur. Diriguntur acies pari utrimque spe, nec ut olim apud Germanos vagis incursibus, aut disjectas per catervas: quippe longa adversum nos militia, insueverant sequi signa, subsidiis firmari, dicta imperatorum accipere. At tunc Arminius equo conlustrans cuncta, ut quosque advectus erat: "Reciperatam libertatem, trucidatas legiones, spolia adhuc et tela Romanis derepta, in manibus multorum" ostentabat: contra "fugacem Maroboduum" appellans, "prœliorum expertem, Hercyniæ latebris defensum, ac mox per dona et legationes petivisse fœdus, proditorem patriæ, satellitem Cæsaris, haud minus infensis animis exturbandum, quam Varum Quinctilium interfecerint: meminissent modo tot prœliorum, quorum eventu, et ad postremum ejectis Romanis, satis probatum, penes utros summa belli fuerit."

XLVI. Neque Maroboduus jactantia sui, aut probris in hostem abstinebat: sed Inguiomerum tenens, "Illo in corpore decus omne Cheruscorum, illius consiliis gesta, quæ prospere ceciderint," testabatur: "vecordem Arminium, et rerum nescium, alienam gloriam in se trahere, quoniam tres vacuas legiones et ducem fraudis ignarum perfidia deceperit, magna cum clade Germaniæ, et ignominia sua, cum conjunx, cum filius ejus, servitium adhuc tolerent. At se duodecim legionibus petitum duce Tiberio, illibatam Germanorum gloriam servavisse: mox conditionibus æquis discessum: neque pœnitere quod ipsorum in manu sit, integrum adversus Romanos bellum, an pacem incruentam malint." His vocibus instinctos exercitus, propriæ quoque causæ stimulabant: cum a Cheruscis Langobardisque, pro antiquo decore, aut recenti liber-

tate; et contra, augendæ dominationi certaretur. Non alias majore mole concursum, neque ambiguo magis eventu, fusis utrimque dextris cornibus. Sperabaturque rursum pugna, ni Maroboduus castra in colles subduxisset. Id signum perculsi fuit: et transfugis paullatim nudatus, in Marcomannos concessit, misitque legatos ad Tiberium oraturos auxilia. Responsum est, "non jure eum adversus Cheruscos arma Romana invocare, qui pugnantes in eumdem hostem Romanos nulla ope juvisset." Missus tamen Drusus, ut retulimus, pacis firmator.

TACIT. ANN. II.

LXXXVIII. Reperio apud scriptores senatoresque eorumdem temporum, Adgandestrii, principis Cattorum, lectas in senatu literas, quibus "mortem Arminii" promittebat, "si patrandæ neci venenum mitteretur:" responsumque esse, "non fraude, neque occultis, sed palam et armatum populum Romanum hostes suos ulcisci:" qua gloria æquabat se Tiberius priscis imperatoribus, qui venenum in Pyrrhum regem vetuerant, prodiderantque. Ceterum Arminius, abscedentibus Romanis, et pulso Maroboduo, regnum adfectans, libertatem popularium adversam habuit: petitusque armis, cum varia fortuna certaret, dolo propinquorum cecidit: liberator haud dubie Germaniæ, et qui non primordia populi Romani, sicut alii reges ducesque, sed florentissimum imperium lacessierit: prœliis ambiguus, bello non victus: septem et triginta annos vitæ, duodecim potentiæ explevit: caniturque adhuc barbaras apud gentes; Græcorum annalibus ignotus, qui sua tantum mirantur: Romanis haud perinde celebris, dum vetera extollimus, recentium incuriosi.

Additional data may be collected from Dio Cassius (LVI. 18—24); but the extracts have already been so lengthy as to leave room only for the remarks of Niebuhr.

LECTURES CIX. CX.

The German wars, which commenced in 740, were the consequence of the conquests in the Alps. The Sigambri seem before this time to have invaded the left bank of the Rhine in our neighbourhood; but they had been repelled by

the Romans, who advanced as far as the westward, though they did not make any conquests. In 740 the Romans attacked the Germans both on the Danube and on the Lower Rhine. The fact that such attacks were never made on the Upper Rhine, as far down as the river Lahn, shows that Suabia was not then a German country; it did not become one until the Alemanni settled there. All we know about this war is vague and indefinite, and the account in Dion Cassius is unfortunately mutilated. It may have been in these campaigns that, as my friend Roth conjectures, Domitius Ahenobarbus penetrated into Germany across the Elbe in Bohemia; for, in the subsequent invasions, we mostly find the Romans marching towards the Elbe from the Lower Rhine. The war was conducted by Tiberius' younger brother, Nero Claudius Drusus, in three campaigns. He advanced from the Lower Rhine across the Weser, as far as the Elbe, and subdued the Bructeri, Sigambri (who were then very renowned), Cherusci, and other tribes. The details of his campaign are not known, and localities are scarcely ever mentioned. Since the Germans had no towns, their only protection was the impassable nature of their country; for they had no fortified places; and, when they met the Romans in the open field, they were usually beaten, being unable to resist the military skill of the Romans. Their country was now ravaged; women and children were carried off into slavery, and the men were put to death like wild beasts; for, although Drusus was otherwise of a mild disposition, considering what the Romans then were, yet he was, like Varus, a great sinner (ἀλιτήριος) towards the Germans. He died in his camp, not without a suspicion of Tiberius having caused his death; but this may have been believed only on account of the hatred which Tiberius entertained against the family of his brother, especially against Germanicus. All that Tiberius could have feared was, that Drusus, like Germanicus, might indulge in the fair dream of restoring the republic.

In 745, after the death of Drusus, Tiberius took the command; and his triumph over the Germans was followed by his withdrawal to Rhodes. During the seven years of

his absence, few important events occurred, except that the Bructeri defeated the legate, M. Lollius, destroyed his legion, and captured the standards. After the return of Tiberius, he received the command in Gaul, to complete the subjugation of Germany; he penetrated as far as the Elbe, and reduced the Sigambri, Bructeri, and Cherusci, to obedience. On the Elbe, he was joined by the Roman fleet, which had been fitted out on the river Ems, or had come from the Rhine to the Ems. How it got up the Elbe cannot be explained; it may have gone up as far as Magdeburg; and yet the Roman galleys could not sail against the current, like steam-boats. After this campaign, Tiberius left Germany, as his predecessors had done, and as many of his successors did after him; for the intention of the Romans was merely to crush the Germans, not to put themselves in possession of their country, which they can hardly have thought worth the trouble of occupying.

While the Germans, north of the Thüringer Wald and about the Harz Mountains, were thus visited by the Romans, there existed in Bohemia the great kingdom of Maroboduus, who is a strange and mysterious phenomenon in the early history of Germany. It is expressly stated that he had a large town (Roviasmum) for his capital, a regular army of seventy thousand men, and four thousand horsemen, a body-guard, and definite political institutions. Justus Möser is perfectly right in saying that the Germans, in the descriptions of the Romans, must not be conceived of as more uncivilized than the modern peasants of Westphalia, or Lower Saxony. Their dwelling-houses, one thousand eight hundred years ago, were, I believe, not different from the more common ones in our own days, and the habitations of their chiefs were the same as the buildings of the middle ages. The notion that the ancient Germans were savages is completely false; they were neither more nor less than uncultivated country-people, to whom life in towns is altogether unknown.

Venantius Fortunatus, in his poem to Radagunda, speaks of the ruined magnificence of her father's empire, and the brass-covered palaces of her ancestors, the kings of Thüringia.

Möser has shown clearly that there is no ground whatever for seeking information respecting our forefathers in the forests of North America, or the islands of the South Sea, and yet people seem at present again inclined to go back to their notions. I do not mean to say that the habitations of the ancient Germans were the same in every respect as those of the present time, for in winter, *e.g.*, they were, no doubt, obliged to have lights in the day-time, all the openings of the house being closed with boards, as they had no glass windows; but this was the case in Rome itself; and similar houses still exist at Rome. I cannot, indeed, see why our ancestors of the fourteenth century should have been much more civilized than they were in the time of Augustus. Maroboduus, however, seems to have had a kingdom which was really in a state of civilization, with feudal institutions which had arisen out of his conquest of Bohemia; for that country had before been inhabited by Boians; that is, Kelts. Tiberius intended to attack him on two sides; he himself assembled his troops in Noricum and Vindelicia, and his legate, Sentius Saturninus, was to advance from the Rhine through the Hercynian and Thuringian forests. The Romans made great preparations, in constructing their roads through Germany. In this campaign we meet with the first traces of the unhappy divisions which characterize the whole history of the Germans; the northern tribes would not assist Maroboduus, because he had not assisted them; he had allowed their power to be broken, so that, in fact, they hardly could assist him; they also mistrusted him, because they believed that it was his intention to make himself master over them, as he had over the Marcomanni. * * * * Maroboduus had done nothing during the insurrection of the Pannonians and Dalmatians, although he must have known that preparations had been making against him. The whole of that part of Germany which lies between the Elbe, the Rhine, and the Westerwald, recognised the supremacy of Rome, as early as the year 760; the Chauci, and other tribes on the coast of East Friesland and Oldenburg, were as much subjects of Rome as the Bructeri and Cherusci in Westphalia. Quintilius Varus, who was descended

from an ancient and illustrious patrician family, for his ancestors are mentioned in the earliest period of the republic, was a man of great ability, but of insatiable avarice. When he had the command of the army in Germany, he conducted himself completely as if he had been governor in a Roman province, which knew only compulsion and fear; but Arminius, the Cheruscan, who had already distinguished himself in the Roman armies, probably in the Pannonian war, devised a skilful plan for entrapping him. As the Germans had no fortified towns, it was exceedingly difficult to keep off the Romans, or to prevent their crossing the frontiers. The German horses were bad, but their riders were superior to the Romans; they were, however, excelled by the Gauls, on account of the better horses and armour of the latter, who were such excellent horsemen, that henceforth they formed the flower of the Roman armies, and most of the technical terms in horsemanship were borrowed from them. Cunning employed against tyranny is not wrong, so that I cannot despise the stratagem of Arminius, for the Germans had been attacked by the Romans in the most unjust manner. Arminius had served with German horsemen in the Roman armies; he was quite master of the Latin language, he had obtained the Roman franchise, and the rank of an eques. By dint of the greatest perseverance, he and his comrades had succeeded in gaining the unlimited confidence of Varus, and contrived to lull him into security. Varus had his stationary camp, in which he administered justice like a Roman governor in his province, and he made his judicial functions subservient to the purpose of enriching himself. His conduct was like that of the wicked governors in Switzerland. The Germans kept Varus engaged by fictitious quarrels among themselves, and made him believe that they felt very happy at the dawn of civilisation among them. The most profound peace seemed to be established, and many of the Roman soldiers were away from the camp on leave of absence. While Varus was indulging in this feeling of security, the tribes of Lower Saxony revolted, according to a preconcerted plan. Varus was induced to march towards the country of the insurgents, into which he penetrated a considerable dis-

tance. There were several limites, or wooden causeways, through the forests and marshes, running from the Rhine as far as the river Lippe, and through Westphalia, to the river Weser. These roads were similar to the one between St. Petersburg and Novgorod, and Moscow. Varus was led by the conspirators to abandon these straight roads, and as he ventured deeper into the country, the revolt became general, and the Romans found themselves outwitted. Varus tried to retreat and reach the causeway, probably with a view of defending himself in the fortress of Aliso on the Lippe.

The question about the exact spot where the battle of Varus was fought, is one of those which, in my opinion, can never be satisfactorily answered. The only sensible and practical mode of investigating the matter, would be to examine from what point a Roman road may have been made into the country of the Germans, and I imagine that Cologne was a convenient point to start from, but the difficulties were pretty nearly the same everywhere. It is infinitely more difficult to determine anything upon this point, than to trace Hannibal's passage over the Alps.

On the first day, Varus was attacked on all sides, and at once lost a great part of his baggage. It was with the greatest difficulty that he formed a camp for the night, and fortified himself. On the following day, he was pressed still harder, but he continued his march. The terror and confusion in his columns were so great, that in the evening, when they were about to pitch their camp, the soldiers could hardly resist the attack. Varus was at last quite overcome by the consciousness of his hopeless situation and his responsibility; and he had several of his officers put an end to their lives. It was probably at that moment that Numonius Vala (apparently the person to whom Horace addressed his epistle) separated the cavalry from the infantry, and endeavoured, but unsuccessfully, to escape with his three squadrons alone. They too were overwhelmed, just as they deserved to be, for having abandoned their companions. On the third day, the whole of the Roman army was annihilated, only a few escaping with their lives. The Germans took awful vengeance upon their oppressors: many of the Roman prisoners were

sacrificed to the gods of the Germans, who offered human sacrifices for the purpose of ascertaining the future. Three legions, with as many alæ, and ten cohorts, were cut to pieces; but, owing to the unfortunate divisions among the Germans, they were unable to make that use of their victory which Arminius would otherwise have undoubtedly have made. Many of the Roman castella, however, were taken and destroyed; and much else may have been done, which the Roman accounts of this catastrophe passed over in silence.*

§ XXI.—STRABO'S NOTICE OF GERMANY.

The details in Strabo are fewer than we expect.

They are also those of a *Greek;* and it must be remembered that it was only through the Romans that the Greeks knew much of Germany; in other words, their knowledge was second-hand.

Hence, the distinction between a *Gaul* and a *German*, so clear to a Roman, was far from being equally clear to a Greek. This remark has been made by Grimm, but without being acted on. Yet the practical bearing of it is important.

Even such a writer as Cæsar does not wholly confine his account of Germany to what he had himself observed. On the contrary, he quotes Eratosthenes, and indicates the opinions of other Greeks. Pliny's account is pre-eminently Greek, whilst Tacitus has evidently, in more places than one, allowed his reading to stand in the place of first-hand investigation. Yet the Greeks were no safe guides; not because they had no powers of observation, but because it was impossible for them to know such a country as Germany without coming in contact with Germans. Still they knew something of it. They knew that it was the land of a certain stock, family, or nation that came under certain negative conditions.

The German was not a *Scythian*, in the way that the natives of the Don were.

Nor an *Illyrian*, as a Taulantian was.

Nor a *Sarmatian*, as the Jazyges were.

* Fuller details for the personal career of Arminius may be found in Professor Creasy's Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World.

Nor *Keltic* or *Gallic*, like a Gaul from the parts about Marseilles.

Nor yet *Iberic*, like a Spaniard.

Nevertheless, he was referable to some great class.

In many cases I believe this class to have been deemed *German*, purely on some such negative trains of reasoning as the preceding; for instance:—I imagine that certain *differentiæ* between the Bastarnæ on one side, and the Sarmatians, Thracians, Galatæ, and Illyrians on the other, made them pass as Germans, in the eyes of such inquiring but imperfectly informed Greeks, as knew that there was an ethnological class called *German*, without knowing accurately what it was. Such a process, *mutatis mutandis*, is by no means uncommon, even in modern investigations. Ethnology, even in the hands of Prichard, has its class called *Allophylian*, the contents being whatever is, at one and the same time, European or Asiatic without being what is called Indo-European.

It is safe, too, to say that the Greeks were such authorities in the eyes of a Roman, that, except where their errors were palpable, they were rarely contradicted. Something of this sort is to be found in the intellectual relations between England and Germany at the present moment. How many points are there in such a question, as (*e.g.*) the ethnology of British India, where the English inquirer, although trusting to himself for particulars lying within the pale of a well-known area, puts his faith in some German for the more general questions that arise, as well as for those results in which book-learning and speculation take a part? And how often is he wrong in doing so?

According to this view, both the Greek and the Roman evidence respecting Germany fall into two parts:—

1. The Greeks—

a. Where they followed the Romans, the only first-hand inquirers, are accurate and trustworthy. But then their evidence is often either superfluous, or else only confirmatory of what we learn from Cæsar and Tacitus.

b. Where their information is not of Roman origin, they are indistinct and inaccurate—indistinct and inaccurate, for the

same reason that an Englishman is indistinct and inaccurate in the geography of Central Africa or the interior of Brazil, want of access.

2. On the other hand, the Romans—

a. Where they speak from actual knowledge, have no occasion to refer to the Greeks.

b. Where, for want of this, they do so, they follow unsafe guides.

The ethnology to which this applies most especially, is that of the *Bastarnæ* and *Peucini*, the *Cimbri* and *Teutones*.

With these preliminaries, we may say of the text of Strabo—

a. That where he follows the historians of Drusus and Tiberius, he is unexceptionable.

b. That where he follows Posidonius, and such writers as could but have written from what they *inferred*, rather than what they knew, he is exceptionable.

What applies to the text of Strabo, as we find it in Strabo himself, applies to those statements in subsequent writers, for which he is the authority.

They give us an *observation* where his evidence is of Roman, and *speculation* or an *inference*, where it is of Greek origin.

Observe.—Those proper names which appear in a different type (Σ ο ύ β α τ τ ο ι), will be the subject of notice in the sequel.

STRABO, VII.

I. *Εὐθὺς τοίνυν τὰ πέραν τοῦ Ῥήνου μετὰ τοὺς Κελτοὺς πρὸς τὴν ἕω κεκλιμένα Γερμανοὶ νέμονται, μικρὸν ἐξαλλάττοντες τοῦ Κελτικοῦ φύλου, τῷ τε πλεονασμῷ τῆς ἀγριότητος καὶ τοῦ μεγέθους, καὶ τῆς ξανθότητος· τἄλλα δὲ παραπλήσιοι καὶ μορφαῖς, καὶ ἤθεσι, καὶ βίοις ὄντες, οἵους εἰρήκαμεν τοὺς Κελτούς. Διὸ δίκαιά μοι δοκοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι τοῦτο αὐτοῖς θέσθαι τοὔνομα, ὡς ἂν γνησίους Γαλάτας φράζειν βουλόμενοι· γνήσιοι γὰρ οἱ Γερμανοὶ κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων διάλεκτον.*

Ἔστι δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα μέρη τῆς χώρας ταύτης τὰ πρὸς τῷ Ῥήνῳ μέχρι τῶν ἐκβολῶν ἀπὸ τῆς πηγῆς ἀρξαμένοις· σχεδὸν δέ τοι καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἑσπέριον τῆς χώρας

πλάτος, ἡ ποταμία πᾶσα. Ταύτης δὲ τὰ μὲν εἰς τὴν Κελτικὴν μετήγαγον Ῥωμαῖοι, τὰ δ' ἔφθη μεταστάντα εἰς τὴν ἐν βάθει χώραν, καθάπερ Μαρσοί· λοιποὶ δ' εἰσὶν ὀλίγοι καὶ τῶν Σουγάμβρων μέρος. Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς παραποταμίους, τ' ἄλλα ἐστὶν ἔθνη τὰ μεταξὺ τοῦ Ῥήνου καὶ τοῦ Ἄλβιος ποταμοῦ· ὃς παράλληλός πως ἐκείνῳ ῥεῖ πρὸς τὸν Ὠκεανὸν, οὐκ ἐλάττω χώραν διεξιὼν, ἤπερ ἐκεῖνος. Εἰσὶ δὲ μεταξὺ καὶ ἄλλοι ποταμοὶ πλωτοὶ (ὧν ἐν τῷ Ἀμασίᾳ Δροῦσος Βρουκτέρους κατεναυμάχησε) ῥέοντες ὡσαύτως ἀπὸ νότου πρὸς βοῤῥᾶν καὶ τὸν Ὠκεανόν. Ἐξῆρται γὰρ ἡ χώρα πρὸς νότον, καὶ συνεχῆ Ἄλπεσι ποιεῖ ῥάχιν τινὰ, πρὸς ἕω τεταμένην, ὡς ἂν μέρος οὖσαν τῶν Ἄλπεων· καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀπεφήναντό τινες οὕτως, διά τε τὴν λεχθεῖσαν θέσιν, καὶ διὰ τὸ τὴν αὐτὴν ὕλην ἐκφέρειν· οὐ μὴν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν γε ὕψος ἀνίσχει τὰ ταύτης μέρη. Ἐνταῦθα δ' ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Ἑρκύνιος δρυμὸς, καὶ τὰ τῶν Σοήβων ἔθνη, τὰ μὲν οἰκοῦντα ἐντὸς τοῦ δρυμοῦ, καθάπου τὰ τῶν Κολδούων· ἐν οἷς ἐστι καὶ τὸ Βουΐαιμον, τὸ τοῦ Μαροβούδου βασίλειον, εἰς ὃν ἐκεῖνος τόπον, ἄλλους τε μετανέστησε πλείους, καὶ δὴ τοὺς ὁμοεθνεῖς ἑαυτῷ Μαρκομμάνους. Ἐπέστη γὰρ τοῖς πράγμασιν οὗτος ἐξ ἰδιώτου, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Ῥώμης ἐπάνοδον· νέος γὰρ ἦν ἐνθάδε, καὶ εὐεργετεῖτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ· ἐπανελθὼν δὲ ἐδυνάστευσε καὶ κατεκτήσατο, πρὸς οἷς εἶπον, Λουίους τε, μέγα ἔθνος, καὶ Ζούμους, καὶ Βούτονας, καὶ Μουγίλωνας, καὶ Σιβινοὺς, καὶ, τὸ τῶν Σοήβων αὐτῶν μέγα ἔθνος, Σέμνωνας. Πλὴν τά γε τῶν Σοήβων, ὡς ἔφην, ἔθνη, τὰ μὲν ἐντὸς ᾤκει, τὰ δὲ ἐκτὸς τοῦ δρυμοῦ, ὅμορα τοῖς Γέταις. Μέγιστον μὲν τὸ τῶν Σοήβων ἔθνος· διήκει γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ῥήνου μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιος· μέρος δέ τι αὐτῶν, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἄλβιος νέμεται, καθάπερ Ἑρμόνδοροι καὶ Λαγκόσαργοι· νῦν δὲ καὶ τελέως εἰς τὴν περαίαν οὗτοί γε ἐκπεπτώκασι φεύγοντες. Κοινὸν δ' ἐστὶν ἅπασι τοῖς ταύτῃ, τὸ περὶ τὰς μεταναστάσεις εὐμαρὲς, διὰ τὴν λιτότητα τοῦ βίου, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ γεωργεῖν, μηδὲ θησαυρίζειν, ἀλλ' ἐν καλυβίοις οἰκεῖν ἐφήμερον ἔχουσι παρασκευήν· τροφὴ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν θρεμμάτων ἡ πλείστη, καθάπου τοῖς Νομάσιν· ὥστ' ἐκείνους μιμούμενοι, τὰ οἰκεῖα ταῖς ἁρμαμάξαις ἐπάραντες, ὅποι ἂν δόξῃ, τρέπονται μετὰ τῶν βοσκημάτων. Ἄλλα δ' ἐνδεέστερά ἐστιν ἔθνη Γερμα-

νικά, Χηροῦσκοί τε καὶ Χάττοι, καὶ Γαμαβριούϊοι, καὶ Χαττουάριοι· πρὸς δὲ τῷ Ὠκεανῷ Σούγαμβροί τε, καὶ Χαῦβοι, καὶ Βρούκτεροι, καὶ Κίμβροι, Καῦκοί τε καὶ Καοῦλκοι, καὶ Καμψιανοὶ, καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους. Ἐπὶ ταῦτα δὲ τῷ Ἀμασίᾳ φέρονται, Βίσουργίς τε, καὶ Λουπίας ποταμὸς, διέχων Ῥήνου περὶ ἑξακοσίους σταδίους, ῥέων διὰ Βρουκτέρων τῶν ἐλαττόνων. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Σάλας ποταμὸς, οὗ μεταξὺ καὶ τοῦ Ῥήνου πολεμῶν, καὶ κατορθῶν Δροῦσος ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ Γερμανικός. Ἐχειρώσατο δ' οὐ μόνον τῶν ἐθνῶν τὰ πλεῖστα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐν τῷ παράπλῳ νήσους, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Βουρχανὶς, ἣν ἐκ πολιορκίας εἷλε.

Γνώριμα δὲ ταῦτα κατέστη τὰ ἔθνη, πολεμοῦντα πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, εἶτ' ἐνδιδόντα, καὶ πάλιν ἀφιστάμενα, ἢ καὶ καταλείποντα τὰς κατοικίας· κᾂν πλείω δὲ γνώριμα ὑπῆρξεν, εἰ ἐπέτρεπε τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὁ Σεβαστὸς, διαβαινειν τὸν Ἄλβιν, μετιοῦσι τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ἐπανισταμένους. Νυνὶ δ' εὐπορώτερον ὑπέλαβε στρατηγεῖν τὸν ἐν χερσὶ πόλεμον, εἰ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ Ἄλβιος καθ' ἡσυχίαν ὄντων ἀπέχοιτο, καὶ μὴ παροξύνοι πρὸς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς ἔχθρας. Ἤρξαντο δὲ τοῦ πολέμου Σούγαμβροι πλησίον οἰκοῦντες τοῦ Ῥήνου, Μέλωνα ἔχοντες ἡγεμόνα· κᾀκεῖθεν ἤδη διεῖχον ἄλλοτ' ἄλλοι, δυναστεύοντες καὶ καταλυόμενοι, πάλιν δ' ἀφιστάμενοι, προδιδόντες καὶ τὰ ὅμηρα καὶ τὰς πίστεις. Πρὸς οὓς ἡ μὲν ἀπιστία, μέγα ὄφελος· οἱ δὲ πιστευθέντες, τὰ μέγιστα κατέβλαψαν, καθάπερ οἱ Χηροῦσκοι, καὶ οἱ τούτων ὑπήκοοι· παρ' οἷς τὰ τρία τάγματα Ῥωμαίων μετὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Οὐάρου Κουϊντιλίου παρασπονδηθέντα, ἀπώλετο ἐξ ἐνέδρας. Ἔτισαν δὲ δίκας ἅπαντες, καὶ παρέσχον τῷ νεωτέρῳ Γερμανικῷ λαμπρότατον θρίαμβον, ἐν ᾧ ἐθριαμβεύθη τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν σώματα καὶ γυναικῶν, Σεμιγοῦντός τε Σεγέστου υἱὸς, Χηρούσκων ἡγεμὼν, καὶ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ, γυνὴ δ' Ἀρμενίου, τοῦ πολεμαρχήσαντος ἐν τοῖς Χηρούσκοις ἐν τῇ πρὸς Οὔαρον Κουϊντίλιον παρασπονδήσει, καὶ νῦν ἔτι συνέχοντος τὸν πόλεμον, ὄνομα Θουσνέλδα, καὶ υἱὸς τριετὴς Θουμελικός· ἔτι δὲ Σεσίθακος Σαιγιμήρου υἱὸς τῶν Χερούσκων ἡγεμόνος, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τούτου Ῥαμὶς, Οὐκρομύρου θυγάτηρ, ἡγεμόνος Βαττῶν, καὶ Δευδόριξ Βαιτόριτος τοῦ Μέλωνος ἀδελφοῦ υἱὸς Σούγαμβρος. Σαιγέστης δὲ ὁ πενθερὸς τοῦ

Ἀρμενίου καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς διέστη πρὸς τὴν γνώμην αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαβὼν καιρὸν ηὐτομόλησε, καὶ τῷ θριάμβῳ παρῆν τῶν φιλτάτων, ἐν τιμῇ ἀγόμενος· ἐπόμπευσε δὲ καὶ Λίβης τῶν Χάττων ἱερεὺς, καὶ ἄλλα δὲ σώματα ἐπομπεύθη ἐκ τῶν πεπορθημένων ἐθνῶν, Καθύλκων *καὶ* Ἀμψάνων, Βρουκτέρων, Νουσίπων, Χηρούσκων, Χάττων, Χαττουαρίων, Λανδῶν, Σουβαττίων. *Διέχει δὲ τοῦ Ἄλβιος ὁ Ῥῆνος περὶ τρισχιλίους σταδίους, εἴ τις εὐθυπορούσας ἔχει τὰς ὁδούς· νυνὶ δὲ διὰ σκολιᾶς καὶ ἑλώδους, καὶ δρυμῶν, κυκλοπορεῖν ἀνάγκη.*

Ὁ δὲ Ἑρκύνιος δρυμὸς πυκνότερός τε ἐστὶ, καὶ μεγαλόδενδρος ἐν χωρίοις ἐρυμνοῖς, κύκλον περιλαμβάνων μέγαν· ἐν μέσῳ δὲ ἵδρυται χώρα καλῶς οἰκεῖσθαι δυναμένη, περὶ ἧς εἰρήκαμεν. Ἔστι δὲ πλησίον αὐτῆς ἥ τε τοῦ Ἴστρου πηγὴ, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ῥήνου, καὶ ἡ μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν λίμνη, καὶ τὰ ἕλη τὰ ἐκ τοῦ Ῥήνου διαχεόμενα. Ἔστι δ' ἡ λίμνη τὴν μὲν περίμετρον σταδίων πλειόνων ἢ τʹ, δίαρμα δὲ ἐγγὺς σʹ. Ἔχει δὲ καὶ νῆσον, ᾗ ἐχρήσατο ὁρμητηρίῳ Τιβέριος *ναυμαχῶν πρὸς* Οὐϊνδελικούς. *Νοτιωτέρα δ' ἐστὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἴστρου πηγῶν καὶ αὕτη, καὶ ὁ Ἑρκύνιος δρυμὸς, ὥστ' ἀνάγκη τῷ ἐκ τῆς* Κελτικῆς *ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑρκύνιον δρυμὸν ἰόντι, πρῶτον μὲν διαπεράσαι τὴν λίμνην, ἔπειτα τὸν Ἴστρον, εἶτ' ἤδη δι' εὐπετεστέρων χωρίων ἐπὶ τὸν δρυμὸν τὰς προβάσεις ποιεῖσθαι δι' ὀροπεδίων. Ἡμερήσιον δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς λίμνης προελθὼν ὁδὸν* Τιβέριος, *εἶδε τὰς τοῦ Ἴστρου πηγάς.* Προσάπτονται *δὲ τῆς λίμνης ἐπ' ὀλίγον μὲν οἱ Ῥαιτοὶ, τὸ δὲ πλέον* Ἑλουήττιοι *καὶ* Οὐϊνδελικοὶ, *καὶ ἡ* Βοΐων *ἐρημία.* Μέχρι Παννονίων *πάντες, τὸ πλέον δ'* Ἑλουήττιοι *καὶ* Οὐϊνδελικοὶ *οἰκοῦσιν ὀροπέδια.* Ῥαιτοὶ *δὲ καὶ* Νωρικοὶ *μέχρι τῶν* Ἀλπείων *ὑπερβολῶν ἀνίσχουσι, καὶ πρὸς τὴν* Ἰταλίαν *περινεύουσιν, οἱ μὲν* Ἰνσούβροις *συνάπτοντες, οἱ δὲ* Κάρνοις, *καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν* Ἀκυληΐαν *χωρίοις. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη ὕλη μεγάλη* Γαβρῆτα· *ἔπειτα δὲ τὰ τῶν* Σοήβων· *ἐπέκεινα δ' ὁ* Ἑρκύνιος *δρυμός· ἔχεται δὲ κἀκεῖνος ὑπ' αὐτῶν.*

II. Περὶ *δὲ* Κίμβρων *τὰ μὲν οὐκ εὖ λέγεται, τὰ δ' ἔχει πιθανότητας οὐ μετρίας. Οὔτε γὰρ τὴν τοιαύτην αἰτίαν τοῦ πλάνητας γενέσθαι καὶ ληστρικοὺς ἀποδέξαιτ' ἄν τις, ὅτι, χεῤῥόνησον οἰκοῦντες, μεγάλῃ πλημμυρίδι ἐξελασθεῖεν ἐκ*

τῶν τόπων· καὶ γὰρ νῦν ἔχουσι τὴν χώραν, ἣν εἶχον πρότερον, καὶ ἔπεμψαν τῷ Σε αστῷ δῶρον, τὸν ἱερώτατον παρ αὐτοῖς λέβητα, αἰτούμενοι φιλίαν, καὶ ἀμνηστίαν τῶν ὑπηργμένων· τυχόντες δὲ, ὧν ἠξίουν, ἀπῆραν· γελοῖον δὲ τῷ φυσικῷ, καὶ αἰωνίῳ πάθει, δὶς ἑκάστης ἡμέρας συμβαίνοντι, παροργισθέντας ἀπελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου. Ἔοικε δὲ πλάσματι, τὸ συμβῆναί ποτε πλημμυρίδα ὑπερβάλλουσαν· ἐπιτάσεις μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀνέσεις δέχεται τεταγμένας δὲ καὶ περιοδιζούσας ὁ Ὠκεανὸς ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις πάθεσιν. Οὐκ εὖ δ' οὐδ' ὁ φήσας ὅπλα αἴρεσθαι πρὸς τὰς πλημμυρίδας τοὺς Κίμβρους, οὐδ' ὅτι ἀφοβίαν οἱ Κελτοὶ ἀσκοῦντες, κατακλύζεσθαι τὰς οἰκίας ὑπομένουσιν, εἶτ' ἀνοιδομοῦσι, καὶ ὅτι πλείων αὐτοῖς συμβαίνει φθόρος ἐξ ὕδατος, ἢ πολέμου, ὅπερ Ἔφορός φησιν. Ἡ γὰρ τάξις ἡ τῶν πλημμυρίδων, καὶ τὸ τὴν ἐπικλυζομένην χώραν εἶναι γνώριμον, οὐκ ἔμελλε ταύτας τὰς ἀτοπίας παρέξειν. Δὶς γάρ ἑκάστης ἡμέρας τούτου συμβαίνοντος, τὸ μηδ' ἅπαξ αἰσθάνεσθαι φυσικὴν οὖσαν τὴν παλίῤῥοιαν καὶ ἀβλαβῆ, καὶ οὐ μόνοις τούτοις συμβαίνουσαν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς παρωκεανίταις πᾶσι, πῶς οὐκ ἀπίθανον; Οὐδὲ Κλείταρχος εὖ· φησὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἱππέας ἰδόντας τὴν ἔφοδον τοῦ πελάγους ἀφιππάσασθαι, καὶ φεύγοντας ἐγγὺς γενέσθαι τοῦ περικαταληφθῆναι. Οὔτε δὲ τοσούτῳ τάχει τὴν ἐπίβασιν ὁρωμένην ἱστοροῦμεν, ἀλλὰ λεληθότως προσιοῦσαν τὴν θάλατταν· οὔτε τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν γιγνόμενον καὶ πᾶσιν ἔναυλον ἤδη ὂν τοῖς πλησιάζειν μέλλουσι, πρὶν ἢ θεάσασθαι, τοσοῦτον ἔμελλε παρέξεσθαι φόβον, ὥστε φεύγειν, ὡς ἂν εἰ ἐξ ἀδοκήτου προσέπεσε.

Ταῦτα δὲ δικαίως ἐπιτιμᾷ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσι Ποσειδώνιος, καὶ οὐ κακῶς εἰκάζει, ὅτι λῃστρικοὶ ὄντες καὶ πλάνητες οἱ Κίμβροι, καὶ μέχρι τῶν περὶ τὴν Μαιῶτιν ποιήσαιντο στρατείαν· ἀπ' ἐκείνων δὲ καὶ ὁ Κιμμέριος κληθείη βόσπορος, οἷον Κιμβρικὸς, Κιμμερίους τοὺς Κίμβρους ὀνομασάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Φησὶ δὲ καὶ Βοΐους τὸν Ἑρκύνιον δρυμὸν οἰκεῖν πρότερον· τοὺς δὲ Κίμβρους ὁρμήσαντας ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, ἀποκρουσθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν Βοΐων ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον, καὶ τοὺς Σκορδίσκους Γαλάτας καταβῆναι· εἶτ' ἐπὶ Ταυριστὰς καὶ Ταυρίσκους, καὶ τούτους Γαλάτας· εἶτ' ἐπὶ Ἑλουηττίους, πολυχρύσους μὲν ἄνδρας, εἰρηναίους δέ· ὁρῶντας δὲ τὸν ἐκ

τῶν λῃστηρίων πλοῦτον, ὑπερβάλλοντα τοῦ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, τοὺς Ἑλουηττίους ἐπαρθῆναι, μάλιστα δ' αὐτῶν Τιγυρήνους τε καὶ Τωυγενοὺς, ὥστε καὶ συνεξορμῆσαι. Πάντες μέν τοι κατελύθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, αὐτοί τε οἱ Κίμβροι, καὶ οἱ συναράμενοι τούτοις, οἱ μὲν ὑπερβάλλοντες τὰς Ἄλπεις εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, οἱ δ' ἔξω τῶν Ἄλπεων.

Ἔθος δέ τι τῶν Κίμβρων διηγοῦνται τοιοῦτον, ὅτι ταῖς γυναιξὶν αὐτῶν συστρατευούσαις, παρηκολούθουν προμάντεις ἱέρειαι πολιότριχες, λευχείμονες, καρπασίνας ἐφαπτίδας ἐπιπεπορπημέναι, ζῶσμα χαλκοῦν ἔχουσαι, γυμνόποδες· τοῖς οὖν αἰχμαλώτοις διὰ τοῦ στρατοπέδου συνήντων ξιφήρεις· καταστέψασαι δ' αὐτοὺς ἦγον ἐπὶ κρατῆρα χαλκοῦν ὅσον ἀμφορέων εἴκοσι· εἶχον δὲ ἀναβάθραν, ἣν ἀναβᾶσα ὑπερπετὴς τοῦ λέβητος ἐλαιμοτόμει ἕκαστον μετεωρισθέντα· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ προχεομένου αἵματος εἰς τὸν κρατῆρα, μαντείαν τινὰ ἐποιοῦντο· ἄλλαι δὲ διασχίσασαι, ἐσπλάγχνευον ἀναφθεγγόμεναι νίκην τοῖς οἰκείοις. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἔτυπτον τὰς βύρσας τὰς περιτεταμένας τοῖς γέῤῥοις τῶν ἁρμαμαξῶν, ὥστ' ἀποτελεῖσθαι ψόφον ἐξαίσιον.

Τῶν δὲ Γερμανῶν, ὡς εἶπον, οἱ μὲν προσάρκτιοι παρήκουσι τῷ Ὠκεανῷ. Γνωρίζονται δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ῥήνου λαβόντες τὴν ἀρχὴν, μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιος. Τούτων δ' εἰσὶ γνωριμώτατοι, Σούγαμβροί τε καὶ Κίμβροι. Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ἄλβιος, τὰ πρὸς τῷ Ὠκεανῷ, πανταπασιν ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ἐστιν. Οὔτε γὰρ τῶν προτέρων οὐδένας ἴσμεν τὸν παράπλουν τοῦτον πεποιημένους πρὸς τὰ ἑωθινὰ μέρη, τὰ μέχρι τοῦ στόματος τῆς Κασπίας θαλάττης, οὔθ' οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι προῆλθόν πω εἰς τὰ περαιτέρω τοῦ Ἄλβιος· ὡς δ' αὔτως οὐδὲ πεζοὶ παρωδεύκασιν οὐδένες. Ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν κατὰ μῆκος ἰοῦσιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἕω, τὰ κατὰ τὸν Βορυσθένη καὶ τὰ πρὸς βοῤῥᾶν μέρη τοῦ Πόντου χωρία ἀπαντᾷ, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν κλιμάτων καὶ τῶν παραλλήλων διαστημάτων. Τί δ' ἐστὶ πέραν τῆς Γερμανίας, καὶ τί τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἑξῆς, εἴτε Βαστάρνας χρὴ λέγειν, ὡς οἱ πλείους ὑπονοοῦσιν, εἴτ' ἄλλους μεταξὺ, ἢ Ἰάζυγας, ἢ Ῥωξολάνους, ἤ τινας ἄλλους τῶν Ἀμαξοίκων, οὐ ῥᾴδιον εἰπεῖν· οὐδ' εἰ μέχρι τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ παρήκουσι παράπαν τὸ μῆκος, εἴ ἐστί τι ἀοίκητον ὑπὸ ψύχους, ἢ ἄλλης αἰτίας, ἢ εἰ καὶ γένος ἀνθρώπων ἄλλο διαδέχεται

μεταξὺ τῆς θαλάττης καὶ τῶν ἑώων Γερμανῶν ἱδρυμενόν· Τοῦτο δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀγνόημα καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐφεξῆς προσαρκτίων ἔλεγεν. Οὔτε γὰρ τοὺς Βαστάρνας, οὔτε τοὺς Σαυρομάτας, καὶ ἁπλῶς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Πόντου οἰκοῦντας ἴσμεν, οὐθ' ὁπόσον ἀπέχουσι τῆς Ἀτλαντικῆς θαλάττης, οὔτ' εἰ συνάπτουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ.

§ XXII. NOTICE OF GERMANY FROM POMPONIUS MELA, III.

II. Rhenus, ab Alpibus decidens, prope a capite duos lacus efficit, Venetum et Acronium. Mox diu solidus, et certo alveo lapsus, haud procul a mari huc et illuc dispergitur; sed ad sinistram amnis etiam tum, et donec effluat, Rhenus; ad dextram primo angustus et sui similis, post ripis longe ac late recendentibus, jam non amnis sed ingens lacus, ubi campos implevit, Flevo dicitur: ejusdemque nominis insulam amplexus, fit iterum arctior, iterumque fluvius emittitur.

III. Germania hinc ripis ejus usque ad Alpes, a meridie ipsis Alpibus, ab oriente Sarmaticarum confinio gentium, qua septentrionem spectat, oceanico litore obducta est. Qui habitant, immanes sunt animis atque corporibus, et ad insitam feritatem vaste utraque exercent, bellando animos, corpora ad consuetudinem laborum, maxime frigoris. Nudi agunt, antequum puberes sint; et longissima apud eos pueritia est: viri sagis velantur, aut libris arborum, quamvis sæva hieme. Nandi non patientia tantum illis, studium etiam est. Bella cum finitimis gerunt: causas eorum ex libidine arcessunt; neque imperitandi prolatandique, quæ possident (nam ne illa quidem enixe colunt), sed ut, circa ipsos quæ jacent, vasta sint. Jus in viribus habent, adeo ut ne latrocinii quidem pudeat; tantum hospitibus boni, mitesque supplicibus: victu ita asperi incultique, ut cruda etiam carne vescantur, aut recenti, aut cum rigentem in ipsis pecudum ferarumque coriis, manibus pedibusque subigendo, renovarunt. Terra ipsa multis impedita fluminibus, multis montibus aspera, et magna ex parte silvis ac paludibus invia. Paludum, Suesia, Estia, et Melsiagum, maximæ: silvarum, Hercynia, et aliquot sunt, quæ nomen habent: sed illa dierum sexaginta iter occupans, ut major aliis, ita et notior. Montium altissimi

Taunus et Rhetico; nisi quorum nomina vix est eloqui ore Romano. Amnium in alias gentes exeuntium, Danubius et Rhodanus; in Rhenum, Mœnis et Lupia; in Oceanum, Amisius, Visurgis et Albis clarissimi. Super Albim Codanus ingens sinus magnis parvisque insulis refertus est. Hac re mare, quod gremio litorum accipitur, nusquam late patet, nec usquam mari simile, verum, aquis passim interfluentibus ac sæpe transgressis, vagum atque diffusum, facie amnium, spargitur: qua litora attingit, ripis contentum insularum non longe distantibus, et ubique pæne tantundem, it angustum et par freto; curvansque se subinde, longo supercilio inflexum est. In eo sunt Cimbri et Teutoni: ultra, ultimi Germaniæ Hermiones.

§ XXIII. PLINY'S NOTICE OF GERMANY.

Pliny's account of Germany is much more Greek, and much less Latin, than we are prepared to expect from an author writing in the language of Cæsar, and subsequent to him.

NAT. HIST. IV.

XXVII. Incipit inde clarior aperiri fama ab gente Ingævonum, quæ est prima inde Germaniæ. Sevo mons ibi immensus, nec Riphæis jugis minor, immanem ad Cimbrorum usque promontorium efficit sinum, qui Codanus vocatur, refertus insulis: quarum clarissima Scandinavia est, incompertæ magnitudinis, portionem tantum ejus, quod sit notum, Hillevionum gente D. incolente pagis, quæ alterum orbem terrarum eam appellat. Nec est minor opinione Eningia. Quidam hæc habitari ad Vistulam usque fluvium a Sarmatis, Venedis, Sciris, *Hirris* tradunt. Sinum Cylipenum vocari: et in ostio ejus insulam Latrin. Mox alterum sinum Lagnum, conterminum Cimbris. Promontorium Cimbrorum excurrens in maria longe peninsulam efficit, quæ Cartris appellatur. Tres et viginti inde insulæ Romanorum armis cognitæ. Earum nobilissimæ, Burchana, Fabaria nostris dicta, a frugis similitudine sponte provenientis. Item Glessaria, a succino militiæ appellata: a barbaris Austrania, præterque Actania.

XXVIII. Toto autem hoc mari ad Scaldim usque fluvium,

Germanicæ accolunt gentes haud explicabili mensura: tam immodica prodentium discordia est. Græci et quidam nostri, vicies quinquies centena millia passuum oram Germaniæ tradiderunt. Agrippa cum Rhætia et Norico longitudinem DCLXXXXVI. millia passuum, latitudinem CXLVIII. M. Rhætiæ prope unius majore latitudine, sane circa excessum ejus subactæ. Nam Germania multis postea annis, nec tota, percognita est. Si conjectare permittitur, haud multum oræ deerit Græcorum opinione, et longitudini ab Agrippa proditæ. Germanorum genera quinque: Vindili; quorum pars Burgundiones: Varini, *Carini*, Guttones. Alterum genus, Ingævones; quorum pars Cimbri, Teutoni, ac Chaucorum gentes. Proximi autem Rheno Istævones; quorum pars Cimbri mediterranei: Hermiones; quorum Suevi, Hermunduri, Chatti, Cherusci. Quinta pars Peucini, Basternæ, supradictis contermini Dacis. Amnes clari in Oceanum defluunt, Guttalus, Vistillus sive Vistula, Albis, Visurgis, Amisius, Rhenus, Mosa. Introrsus vero, nullo inferius nobilitate, Hercynium jugum prætenditur.

XXIX. In Rheno ipso, prope centum M. pass. in longitudinem, nobilissima Batavorum insula, et Cannenifatum: et aliæ Frisiorum, Chaucorum, *Frisiabonum*, *Sturiorum*, *Marsaciorum*, quæ sternuntur inter Helium ac Flevum. Ita appellantur ostia, in quæ effusus Rhenus, ab septemtrione in lacus, ab occidente in amnem Mosam se spargit: medio inter hæc ore, modicum nomini suo custodiens alveum.

The next author in point of time is Tacitus himself.

C. CORNELII TACITI

DE SITU, MORIBUS,

ET POPULIS GERMANIÆ

LIBELLUS.

---

§ I. GERMANIA[1] omnis[2] a Gallis[3] Rhætisque[4] et Pannoniis,[5] Rheno[6] et Danubio[7] fluminibus,[8] a Sarmatis[9] Dacisque,[10] mutuo metu aut montibus[11] separatur. Cetera Oceanus ambit, latos sinus et insularum immensa spatia complectens, nuper cognitis quibusdam gentibus, ac regibus, quos bellum aperuit. Rhenus Rhæticarum Alpium[12] inaccesso ac præcipiti vertice ortus, modico flexu in Occidentem versùs, septemtrionali Oceano miscetur. Danubius, molli et clementer edito montis Abnobæ[13] jugo effusus, plures populos[14] adit, donec in Ponticum mare sex meatibus erumpat: septimum enim os paludibus hauritur.

NOTES ON SECTION I.

[1] *Germania.*]—The English word *Germany* is the translation of the Latin word *Germania.*

A truism so evident, apparently, requires no pointing out; nevertheless, the series of considerations to which it gives rise are of importance.

In the first place, *Germany* is not the name by which the *German* designates his own country. He calls himself *Deutsche,* and his country *Deutsch-land.*

Neither is it the name by which a Frenchman designates *Germany*. He calls it *Allemagne*.

Whence the difference? The different languages take the different names for one and the same country from different sources.

The German term *Deutsch* is an *adjective;* the earlier form of the word being *diutisc*. Here the *-isc* is the same as the *-ish* in words like *self-ish*. *Diut*, on the other hand, means *people*, or *nation*. Hence, *diut-isc* is to *diut*, as *popularis* is to *populus*. This adjective was first applied to the *language;* and served to distinguish the *popular*, *national*, *native*, or *vulgar* tongue of the populations to which it belonged from the Latin. It first appears in documents of the ninth century, "Ut quilibet episcopus homilias apertè transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut *theotiscam*, quo tandem cuncti possint intelligere quæ dicantur."—Synodus Turonensis, A.D. 813.

As to the different forms in which either the root or the adjective appears, the most important of them are as follows:—

1. In Mœso-Gothic, *þiudiskô* = ἐθνικῶς — Galatians ii. 14; a form which implies the substantive *þiuda*=ἔθνος.

2. In Old High German, *diot*=*populus*, gives the adjective *diut-isc*=*popul-aris*.

3. In Anglo-Saxon we have *þeód* and *þeódisc*.

Sometimes this adjective means *heathen;* in which case it applies to religion and is opposed to *Christian*.

Oftener it means *intelligible*, or *vernacular*, and applies to language; in which case it is opposed to *Latin*.

The particular Gothic dialect to which it was first applied, was the German of the Middle Rhine. Here the forms are various:— *theodisca*, *thiudisca*, *theudisca*, *teudisca*, *teutisca*. When we reach parts less in contact with the Latin language of Rome, its use is rarer. Even the Germans of the Rhine frequently use the equivalent term *Alemannic*, and *Francic;* whilst the Saxons and Scandinavians never seem to have recognized the word at all.

Hence it is only the Germans of *Germany* that are *Theot-isci*, or *Deut-sche*.

We of England, on the other hand, apply it only to the *Dut-ch* of Holland.

Hitherto the term is, to a certain degree, one of disparagement; meaning *non-Roman*, or *vulgar*. It soon, however, changes its character; and in an Old High German gloss—*uncadiuti* (*ungideuti*)

=*un-Dutch* is explained by *barbarus*. All that is not German, has now become in the eyes of the *Deut-sche*, what all that was other than *Roman* was before. The standard has changed. Barbarism is measured by its departure from what is *Dut-sch;* in other words, the term has become so little derogatory as to have become national.

Nevertheless, originally *Deutsche*=*vulgares*.

From the two facts of *Germania* being no native name, and *Deutsche* being one of late origin, we arrive at an inference of great practical importance in ethnological criticism, *viz.*, that, although the Romans and the Gauls knew the populations beyond the Rhine by a common *collective* term, no such common *collective* term seems to have been used by the Germans themselves. *They had none.* Each tribe had its own designation; or, at most, each kingdom or confederation. Only when the question as to what was common to the whole country, in opposition to what was *Roman* or *Gallic*, became a great practical fact, did a general ethnological term arise; and this was not *German*, but *Dutch*.

This is a common phenomenon. In Hindostan we hear of the wilder mountaineers of Orissa and the Mahratta country under the names of Kól and Khond; and this is a collective term. But it is only this in the mouth of a Hindu, or Englishman. Amongst themselves the separate names of the different tribes is all that is current.

From this it follows that, *Germania* being a *non*-Germanic term, its claims to absolute ethnological accuracy are reduced. It is like the term *Gallia;* which was so far from containing nothing but Gallic Kelts (or, changing the expression, Keltic Gauls), that it included the *Iberic* populations of Aquitania, which were as unlike the true Gaul as a Basque of the Pyrenees is unlike a Welshman. Hence, whenever we are disposed to doubt whether so valuable a writer as Tacitus could have committed the error of making any particular *non*-Germanic tribe German, we must remember that so well-informed an observer as Cæsar makes the Aquitani, Gallic.

It is also important to remember that, like *high* as opposed to *low*, *rich* to *poor*, &c., the word *Deut-sch* was originally a *correlative* term, *i.e.*, it denoted something which was *popular*, *vulgar*, *national*, *unlearned*, to something which was not. Hence, it could have had no existence until the relations between the learned and lettered language of Rome, and the comparatively unlearned and unlettered *vulgar tongue* of the Franks and Alemanni had developed

some notable points of contrast. *Deut-sche* as a name for *Germans*, in the sense in which it occurs in the *ninth* century, was an impossibility in the *first*, or *second*. This is not sufficiently considered. Many believe that the *Teut-*, in *Teut-ones*, is the *deut-*, in *deut-sch*. To be this *exactly* is impossible. Any German tribe that called itself *þeuda*, *Diot*, or *Deoð* in the first century must have given a different meaning to the word; and, so doing, have called themselves *homines*, *heroes*, or by some term equally complimentary;—certainly not by any word meaning *speakers of the vulgar tongue*.

This is to prepare the reader for some further criticism, which will occur in the sequel.

Allemagne and Lamagna are merely modernized forms of the name of a particular section of the Germans, the *Alemanni*.

The English name, as already stated, is a translation of the Roman one.

Germani, then, is a name given by the Romans to the populations who afterwards called themselves *Deutsche*; and *Germania* is the Roman equivalent to *Deutschland*; whilst *German* and *Germany* are English forms of the Roman designation.

It by no means, however, follows, that because the Romans called a certain people by a certain name, that that name was *Roman*; although reasons have been given * for considering that it is the Latin word *germani*.

I believe, for my own part, that the word was Keltic; in other words, that whilst the Germans themselves had no collective name at all, the Romans called them what they were called by the Gauls. The meaning of this Gallic designation is a matter of legitimate speculation. At present, it is sufficient to fix the language in which the etymology is to be sought.

The date of the first mention of the name German is more curious than important. A distinction, however, connected with the investigation of it is necessary.

The earliest date assigned to an event in German history is one thing; the earliest historian who mentions such an event is another. A very early event may be recorded by a very late historian.

The word *semi-Germanis* was applied to the nations who, as early as the second Carthaginian war, came across Hannibal in his passage of the Alps. But, early as this is for the fact itself, the historian who records it is late—Livy.

* See extract from Strabo, *Prolegomena*, § xxi.

The same applies to certain statements concerning the part taken by the *Bastarnæ* in the Macedonian war.—See not. in v. *Bastarnæ*.

In the Fasti Capitolini for B.C. 222, occurs the following entry:—M. CLAUDIUS M. F. M. N. MARCELLUS AN. DXXXI. COS. DE GALLEIS INSUBRIBUS ET G[ER]MANIS K. MART. ISQUE SPOLIA OPI(*ma*) RETTULIT DUCE HOSTIUM VIR(*domaro ad Cla*)STID(*ium interfecto*).—Græv. Thes. Antt. Rom. ii. p. 227.

This is a notice of some pretension. Polybius, however, calls the allies of the Insubrian Gauls not Germans but *Gæsatæ*.

More than this—the record itself is not above suspicion. The part of the stone which contains the letters ER, has been repaired, and (the extract is from Niebuhr) whether ER "was put in at random, or whether it was so on the original stone, I can neither assert nor deny. I have often seen the stone, but although a friend of mine wished me particularly to ascertain the truth, I was never able to convince myself whether the corner containing the syllable is part of the original stone or not. It is evident that the name cannot have been Cenomanis, since they were allied with the Romans, and the *g* is quite distinct. *Gonomani* does not occur among the Romans. If the author of these Fasti actually wrote *Germanis*, the nation is mentioned. The thing is not at all impossible. At the time of Julius Cæsar, it is true, the Germans did not live further south than the river Maine, driven back by the Gauls. The Germans in the Wallis,* of whom Livy (xxi. 38) speaks, were the remnants of an earlier German population which had been expelled by the Gauls.'—Lecture LVIII. Dr. L. Schmitz's edition.

Of German *glosses* the words *Thule*, and the different forms of the root *Est-* (see not. in v. *Æstyii*) are probably the oldest. They are referable to the date of the voyage of Pytheas, and must have been collected from really Germanic informants.

Of German *authorities* Cæsar, for all practical purposes, is the earliest.

Of the name *Germani*, beyond the probable German area, there are some remarkable instances.

a. In Spain we have "*Oretani* qui et *Germani* cognominantur."—Pliny, iii. 4.

b. In Persia Von Hammer has traced the name *Dzhurman*.

Writers have not been wanting who have connected these names with that of the Germani of Germany. I do not say that it cannot

* These are the supposed Germans of note 3.

be done legitimately: at the same time the occurrence of similar names, although unlikely to be accidental within a *small* area, gains in probability as the area enlarges.

[2] *Omnis—separatur.*]—Does this mean that within the area called *Germania* there were nothing but Germans?

Or does it mean that beyond the area called *Germania* there were no Germans?

Does it exclude all Gauls, Rhætians, Pannonians, Sarmatians and Dacians from Germany, or does it exclude all Germans from Gaul, Rhætia, Pannonia, Sarmatia, and Dacia?

Both questions require investigation.

That there were *non-Germanic* populations within the *Germania* of Tacitus, probably consisting of Gauls, and certainly consisting of Slavonians, Lithuanians, and Finns, is one of the main theorems of the present volume; a theorem for which the reasons may be found in notes as well as in the preliminary observations.

The complementary question as to absence or presence of German populations in Gaul, Rhætia, Pannonia, Sarmatia, and Dacia will form part of the subject of the next three notes.

[3] *Gallis.*]—Here the question arises as to whether the *Gauls* formed what may be called an *ethnological unity: i.e.*, first, whether the whole of the Gallic stock was contained within the area of Gallia; and, secondly, whether that area contained nothing but Gallic populations.

1. The whole of the Gallic stock was *not* contained within the area of Gaul.—The Britons of England and Wales, the Picts and Scots of Scotland, and the numerous tribes of Ireland were all members of the great Gallic stock—a stock also called Keltic.

2. Populations other than those of the Gallic stock existed in Gaul.—Between the Aquitanians to the *south* and the Gauls to the *north* of the Loire, there was a greater ethnological difference than between the Gauls north of the Loire, and the Britons; or even the Caledonian and Hibernian tribes. The Aquitanians belonged to the *Iberic* stock; represented at present by the Basques of the Pyrenees. The rest were *Kelts.*

Such are the *general* answers to the *general* question. The *particular* inquiry as to whether there were *Germans* in Gaul, the inquiry indicated in the preceding note, still stands over.

That there were *some* Germans in Gaul is undoubted. We can

scarcely expect that the Rhine should have been as absolute a frontier in history as it is in geography. Each nation transgressed it, so that there were Gauls in Germany, and Germans in Gaul.

But comparatively recent migrations—mere changes in the line of frontier—are not the matters before us. There are Englishmen in India; but that does not make India English. Was so notable a proportion of Gaul occupied by *indigenous* Germans as to justify us in calling Gaul a part of the Germanic area, or the Germans a part of the population of Gaul? Were there Germans in Gaul in the same way that there were Iberians in the time of Cæsar, or Bretons now? Were there Germans in Gaul as there are Welshmen in England?

The present writer believes that, *in the time of Tacitus*, there were none such.

Were there *before* the time of Tacitus? Zeuss and others believe that there were. The evidence in favour of these early Gallo-Germans consists chiefly, if not exclusively, in an extract from Livy, and in the forms of certain words.

The extract from Livy (forming the *external* evidence) is as follows. Speaking of the passage of Hannibal, he writes, "ea—itinera—quæ ad Peninum* ferunt, obsepta gentibus *semi-Germanis* fuissent."—xxi. 38.

The *internal* evidence, consisting of the real or supposed names of the tribes in question, is got at through a considerable amount of assumption. Avienus, who is supposed to follow an older authority, writes—

> Meat amnis † autem fonte per *Tylangios*,
> Per *Daliternos*, per *Chabilcorum* sata,
> *Temenicum* et agrum (dura sat vocabula
> Auremque primam cuncta vulnerantia;
> Sed non silenda tibimet ob studium tuum
> Nostramque curam). Panditur porro in decem
> Passus recursu gurgitum stagnum grave.
> Plerique tradunt, inserit semet dehinc
> Vastam in paludem, quem vetus mos Græciæ
> Vocavit Accron.—*Ora Maritima*, II. 666, &c.

Now Zeuss, who believes these to be the oldest German names extant, and who thinks that they stand for tribes who occupied the

* This is what Niebuhr calls the *Wallis* (*i.e.*, the *Wales*, *Welsh*, *foreign* or *non-German* country) in note 1.

† The Rhone.

Pennine Alps anterior to the Keltic migrations towards Italy, suggests the following etymologies and parallels.

a. Tylangii.—The same as the *Tulingi* of Cæsar, with the *a* changed into *i*, by the Greek authority of Avienus, so that the word becomes Τυλάγγιοι, instead of Τυλίγγιοι. The *-ing* (-ιγγ) is the usual German derivational affix, and the *Tul-*, the root of the first part of the compound word Τουλίφουρδον (a German town mentioned by Ptolemy), and *til-*, a root signifying *useful, fit.*

b. Daliterni.—Agreeing in its termination with the words Bast*ernæ*, and Gub*erni*, and in its beginning with the root *dal=valley, dale.*

c. Chabilci.—The Καοῦλκοι of Strabo, the Καλούκωνες of Ptolemy and the *Calucones* of Pliny.

The objections that lie against all this are—

1. The identity between the tribes named by Avienus and those indicated by Livy is not made out.

2. The tribes with whom the Tylangii and Chabilci are compared are not themselves unequivocally Germanic.

3. Cæsar, describing the same locality, calls the population *Gallic;* especially mentioning one of the tribes named by Livy the *Veragri.*

It may fairly be said that all this creates difficulties, and justifies the statement that the literal verification of the passage in Livy involves a considerable amount of assumption.

Besides this, in order to reconcile Livy with Cæsar, Zeuss supposed an intermixture of Gallic immigrants and German aborigines. This introduces greater difficulties than it removes.

In the first place, the Germans in question, if aboriginal, were disconnected from their nearest congeners by the whole of Helvetia, a locality confessedly Gallic.

Secondly, a mountain-fastness like the Mons Penninus was not likely to be a spot from which Gauls would displace Germans.

No remark has been made upon the etymologies themselves. They are derivations which certain readers will be as slow to abandon, as others are to admit. Neither is the undoubted Gallic form of the word *Veragri* insisted on; since, although a Gallic word, it might be the designation of a German nation—just as *Welsh* is in our language, a name applied to Welshmen, but not a Welsh word.

On the other hand, it may be urged, that the Veragri may have been semi-German without Cæsar's knowing it, or that Cæsar may have known them to be semi-Germans without thinking it necessary

to call them so. There is no conclusive answer to this objection. It is not, however, one which the careful reader of Cæsar, unbiassed by German predilections, is likely to take. How clearly does he recognise the Germanic elements of the character of the Nervii and others, and how careful he is to notify them!

Surely, it is not too much to say that in *Cæsar's* time the Pennine population was wholly Gallic, and not half-German.

Now if we do this, Livy's credit must be saved by either supposing that he used the word *German* with a considerable degree of latitude, or else that his statement applies to the time he wrote about rather than his own.

I believe the former to have been the case, and answer the question raised in the beginning of the present note, by asserting my belief that, as the *Tylangii*, &c., were *non*-Germanic, there were no Germans, as integral elements of the population of Gallia, either when Tacitus wrote or when Hannibal marched across the Alps.

[4] *Rhætis.*]—The countries south of the Danube were first subdued under Augustus; when they were formed into the following provinces. 1. Rhætia. 2. Vindelicia. 3. Noricum. 4. Pannonia Superior. 5. Pannonia Inferior.

Rhætia, the modern Tyrol, was bounded by Helvetia on the west, by Vindelicia on the north, and by Noricum on the east. From Noricum it was divided by the River Inn (Ænus).

Vindelicia coincides with the southern half of Bavaria, or that portion of Bavaria which lies south of the Danube, and part of Wurtemburg. It was bounded on the north-west by the Decumates Agri=Baden, and part of Wurtemberg.

Noricum, the modern Salzburg, and Upper Austria, extended from the Inn (Ænus) to the Kahlenberg (Mons Cetius).

The Pannonias were bounded by the Kahlenberg, the Danube, and the Save, and coincide with the south-western part of Hungary, and Lower Austria.

Now of these four names for five provinces, Tacitus mentions only two,—Rhætia and Pannonia. Of Vindelicia and Noricum he says nothing,—although each reached to the Danube; which Rhætia, in the strict sense of the word, did not.

Vindelicia, then, he evidently includes in the area of the Rhæti. What, however, he considered Noricum to be, is doubtful. Did he count it as part of Pannonia on the east, or as part of Rhætia on the

east, or did he give a part to the one province, and a part to the other?

There is a difficulty here, which is increased by the fact of the Danube forming but partially the Rhæto-Germanic frontier. A considerable portion of the Rhætia of Tacitus reached the Danube as its northern limit, without, therefore, reaching the southern frontier of Germany. The Decumates Agri lay north of the Danube, between Vindelicia, Gaul, and Germany. Yet it is by no means certain, that the Decumates Agri were German.—See not. in voc.

Perhaps a more minute investigation than the present writer has had the opportunity of making, into the early history of the Danubian provinces just enumerated, would account for the omission of the names *Vindelicia* and *Noricum*, and at the same time to inform us how the Norican population was to be distributed. At present, however, I consider that Tacitus, in mentioning the *Rhæti* and *Pannonii* * only, recognized the *ethnological* rather than the *political* division, and thought of the natural division of an area into its nationalities rather than of the artificial distinction of provinces.

If so, we have an instrument of criticism; since we may infer that the Vindelici were in the same category with the Rhæti, and that the Norici were either Rhætian or Pannonian, or else divided between the two.

The ethnological position of the Rhætians, the extent to which they consisted of one or several stocks, and their relations to the population of Noricum, are difficult and complicated questions. Neither are they true portions of German ethnology.

Hence the present note will contain little beyond the notice of the country and its occupants in their present state.

Politically speaking, Rhætia with Vindelicia, comprises the following countries and districts.—1. The Vorarlberg. 2. The Grisons, or Graubründten. 3. The Valteline. 4. The Tessino. 5. The Tyrol. 6. Part of Lombardy. These form Rhætia proper. The southern part of Bavaria, the south-eastern part of Wurtemburg, and a small portion of Baden constitute Vindelicia.

Geographically viewed, this area embraces a portion of two water-systems, and a water-shed, *viz.*, the southern feeders of the Upper Danube, and the northern feeders of the Po; the water-shed between them being formed by the Alps. Besides these the head-waters of the Rhine belong to Rhætia.

* Or the *Rhæti* and *Pannoniæ*.

The Bavarian side of the great Alpine chain consists of an elevated table-land, the Italian of a series of mountain-valleys, which change in character as we approach the alluvial plain of Lombardy; and as these change, we pass from Rhætia to Italy, from the Tyrol and Switzerland to Lombardy.

At the present moment the population of this area is referable to two divisions. A German dialect of the Alemannic type is spoken in Bavaria, Wurtemburg, Baden, the Vorarlberg, and greater part of the Tyrol. The remaining dialects are derivatives from the Latin. It is necessary to know that these last fall into two divisions; the *Italian* of Lombardy, the Valteline, and Tessino, and the *Romance* of the Grisons or Graubründten. It is the Grison or Graubründten country which is pre-eminently and typically Rhætian; the Grison mountains are the *Rhætian* Alps, and the *Grison* form of speech is often called the *Rhætian* language.

If, from the Lake of Constance, we follow up the Rhine towards its source, we find that river and the Inn rise on different sides of the same range of mountains. Now the valleys of the Upper Rhine and the Upper Inn constitute the Grison country, where the Romance language is spoken, and where it falls into two chief dialects, coinciding with the two river-systems. The proper *Romance* is the language of the hills and valleys on the Upper Rhine; the *Ladino*, or Latin, that of those on the Upper Inn. Then sub-dialects occur; the Ladino falling into the *Upper* Engadino, and the *Lower* Engadino; the Romance into several similar ones.

Such is the present philological ethnography of the Rhætias. But as both classes of languages have been introduced into the country within the historical period—the German in the fifth and sixth centuries, and the Roman in the time of Augustus—neither throws much light upon the character of the original population.

Were there any Germans in Rhætia? Germans might have been found in the northern point of Vindelician Rhætia, just as there were Germans in Gaul; *i.e.*, as intrusive emigrants, but not as integral portions of the original Rhæto-Vindelician population.

[5] *Pannoniis.*]—Laying aside the question as to the distribution of the populations of *Noricum*, the portion of the Danube which separated Pannonia Proper from the Germany of Tacitus, was that part which lies between the northern extremity of the Kahlenberg (*Mons Cetius*), and the continuation of the Bakonyer Wald (*Pan-*

nonius Mons) into the Medves Range (*Sarmatici Montes*); from the west to Vienna, to the east of the Gran. A little beyond this the Danube takes its great bend southwards, and separates the eastern Pannonians from the Jazyges. The parts of the *Germania* of Tacitus which reach the Pannonian part of the Danube, coincide with the present country of *Upper* Hungary, or the valleys of the Gran and Waag.

The languages here spoken are, at the present moment referable to three families,—1. German in Lower Austria, and on the side of Lower Austria. 2. Slavonic on the side of Styria, Croatia, and Slavonia. 3. Majiar, or Proper Hungarian in the central parts.

The present population of Pannonia cannot but be extremely mixed, since, over and above the present occupants, there have been successive invasions of Romans, Goths, Huns, Avars, Cumanians, and Gepidæ. All this complicates the inquiry as to the ethnological position of the original ante-Roman Pannonians.

At the same time, by eliminating those elements, which we know to have been of recent introduction, we approach the question.

Of these two have occurred within the historical period.

The Germans of Lower Austria are the Germans of Upper Austria advanced eastwards, and the Germans of Upper Austria are the Germans of Bavaria similarly protruded. Their language is referable to the Alemannic type; their original ancestors were probably Alemanni, and the date of their occupancy is not earlier than the fourth century.

The Majiars are even of later introduction, and their advent even more within the range of history. It took place in the tenth century.

The Goths, Huns, Avars, Cumanians, have all occupied parts of Pannonia—but all within the historical period, or nearly so. The aborigines preceded all these.

The original population of Pannonia must be arrived at by the *exclusive method*, *i.e.*, the elimination of all *known* recent populations.

Now the population that remains after this is that of the *Slovaks* of Upper Hungary, who are Slavonians.

The ethnology of those parts of Pannonia which was not German is no part of the present work. Many reasons, however, beyond the existence of the Slovaks could be given for making it Slavonian.

At the same time, there is but little doubt that the banks of the Danube were occupied by *intrusive* Germans at an early period.

6 *Rheno.*]—The *Rhine*, is a name by which the same river is known to both the French of its western, and the Germans of its eastern bank. This is not always the case in the frontier rivers; since they may bear one name in one language, and another in another. It is far from certain that this was not the case with the Rhine originally.

The French and Germans know it by the same name, not because their ancestors did, but because each has taken their appellation from the Romans; the word *Rhenus* is in the same category with *Germania*.

From whom did the Romans take it? To what ancient language is it referable? Almost certainly to the Keltic of Gaul; in which the Gauls *originated*, but the Romans *diffused* the name. It *might* of course have been German as well; though I think it unlikely, the original *German* name being probably lost.

Neither is it certain that the name *Rhine* was persistent throughout the whole course of the river. The Lower Rhine might have had one name, the Upper Rhine another, just as the Lower Danube was called Ister, and the Upper, Danubius. It is not likely that the Batavians of Holland, and the Helvetians of Switzerland gave the same name to the very different parts of their common river. Names of rivers only become general where there is one homogeneous population along their whole course; or, what is the same thing, when a second party perceives the unity of the whole water-system. This was what was done by the Romans, and that is the reason for believing that, originally, the name *Rhine* was a *partial* one.

Is this term, or one like it, applied to any other Keltic rivers, so that there may be several *Rhines* in France, just as there are several *Ouses* and *Avons* in England? The bearing of this question is of importance. As the question stands at present, the word is a Keltic gloss of no great value, though of some. It is only a proper name. If, however, it reappears as the designation of other rivers, the chances are that it is no *proper name*, but a *common term;* no word, like *John* or *Thomas*, but a word like *water*, *river*, *stream*. Glosses of this kind are more valuable than the others.

Rhen is probably the same root as *Rhodan;* so that *Rhine* and *Rhone* are the same word in different dialects. The disappearance of the *d* creates no difficulty. The very word *Rhone*, as compared with *Rhodanus*, illustrates it.

It is also, probably, the same word with *E-ridan-us;* the ejection

of the *-d*, being of the same kind as that of the *d* in *Rho-d-anus* as opposed to *Rhone*. The Eridanus of Herodotus (iii. 115) was a river in the extreme west of Europe, which fell into the northern sea.

The form *Rhenus* was first diffused by Cæsar.

The fact of *rein* in German meaning *clear*, and the possibility of the *Rhein fluss* = *the clear river*, is the only reason that has ever been given for considering the word of *German* origin. Even Zeuss lays no stress on this.

The Keltic origin of the name of the great frontier river is generally admitted. So is the Keltic origin of the names of most of its *western* tributaries, the Nava and the Mosa. The river Obringa, Ἀϐρίκκας, Ὀϐρίγγας, is probably Keltic. The Mosella seems a *Roman* diminutive of Mosa.

Of the eastern feeders, the Mænus and Luppia are of uncertain origin. So are the Nicer and Logana. The Rura and Sigana are, perhaps, German.

[7] *Danubio.*]—The extent to which the root *Danub-* approaches that of *Dnap-*, in the undoubtedly Slavonic *Dnaparis*, or Dnieper, is an argument, as far it goes, for the word being of Slavonic origin.

The extent to which the root *D-n*, as in *Don* and *Doon* occurs in the name of Keltic rivers, is an argument, as far as it goes, for the word being of Keltic origin.

The fact of its changing its name to Ister, for the lower portion of its course, is an argument, as far as it goes, in favour of the population of the banks being other than homogeneous, *i.e.*, of one kind, at the head-waters, of another towards the mouth.

[8] *Fluminibus.*]—Let the direction of river from north to south, or *vice versâ*, be called a *latitudinal* or a *vertical* direction; and a direction from east to west, or *vice versâ*, a *longitudinal* or *horizontal* one.

This distinction gives rise to the consideration of some points of general ethnology.

The more *vertical* the direction of a river—other things being equal—the *less* homogeneous its population.

The more *horizontal* the direction of a river—other things being equal—the *more* homogeneous its population.

A little consideration explains this. Difference of latitude is a great ethnological influence; and as the character of a population

changes as we proceed either northwards or southwards more than it does in a direction from east to west, or from west to east, the contrast between the population of the head-waters, and the population of the embouchures of long rivers is greater where the difference of latitude is greatest, and least where it is least—other things, as said before, being equal.

The great vertical rivers of Northern Asia have the conquering Mongol and Turks on their sources, the stunted Samoeids on the mouths.

The great vertical rivers of Southern Asia have Tibetan mountains, between the thirtieth and thirty-fifth degrees of north latitude, and Siamese and Cambojians in latitude ten.

The Nile has Negroes in its extreme valleys, Abyssinians on its table-land, and Ægyptians on its great valley and Delta.

The northernmost Mississippi Indians approach the type of the Eskimo, the southernmost that of the Mexicans.

Most of the great rivers of the world are *vertical;* the chief horizontal directions being those of the Amazon in America, the Senegal in Africa, the Hoang-ho and Kiang-ku in Asia, and the *Danube* in Europe.

The horizontal direction of the two great Chinese rivers undoubtedly does much towards determining the homogeneous character of the Chinese civilization. At the same time they help to account for its isolation.

The direction then is one of difference between the Danube as boundary to *Germania* and the Rhine.

The course of the Danube determined the migration eastward, those of the Rhine (and still more of the Weser and Elbe) northward.

Another difference between the two rivers is the character of their water-system. Contrasted with the Danube the Rhine has but few feeders; indeed it has but few feeders compared with any river of equal magnitude, unless it be the Rio Grande of Texas. The Rhine is *supported* as the *reservoir* of the Lake of Constance rather than *supplied* by its *tributaries.* From this it follows that the basin or valley-system of the Rhine is preeminently small; so that its alluvial plains sink into insignificance when compared with those of the Danube, or even the Elbe, Oder, and Vistula. Whatever we subtract from the area of the valleys of a river, brings the hill-ranges in closer approximation to the stream, in which we have a mountain-

barrier, as well as a water-barrier. In the particular instance before us, the Rhine is a Gallo-Germanic frontier, but it is a frontier strengthened in its upper part, at least, by the ranges of the Black-forest, the Odenwald, and the Vosges. In its lower portion, as the mountains either recede or diminish, and the alluvial plains extend themselves, it ceases to be a frontier.

Again—the facilities of a migration down the Danube are greater than those down the Rhine; a circumstance to which the directions of the two rivers, as well as the difference of their water-system contributes.

9 *Sarmatis.*]—It is not necessary to exhibit in full the different senses in which this word occurs in the classical writers. It is a term less wide in its application than *Scythæ*, but, like *Scythæ*, it is applied to the *northern* moieties of the ancient world; the most southern limit of Sarmatia being the Danube. On the west it becomes confounded with Germania, on the east with Asiatic Scythia.

Geographically, it chiefly applies to *Eastern Europe; Scythia* being chiefly referable to *Western Asia.*

Ethnologically, it embraces *nearly* all the Slavonic areas, and few or none of the *non*-Slavonic.

This justifies its application, by the present writer, to the class which contains the Lithuanic as well as the Slavonic tongues.

The Sarmatæ of the present text—the Sarmatæ of the Germanic frontier—are the original occupants of the country between the Upper Thiess (*Tibiscus*) and the Medves Range (*Montes Sarmatici*). These were the northern *Jazyges*, or the old Slavonic populations of Middle Hungary.

That either these *Jazyges* themselves, or else their neighbours to the east, west, or south were Slavonians, is a fact which is supported by internal evidence of the most conclusive kind; and as the undoubted presence of a Slavonic population in the parts occupied by them, is of great importance in the investigation of the ethnology of Pannonia and Dacia, due prominence is given to it by mentioning it at the present time.

The term *gazyk* (*yazyk*) is a Slavonic form.

It means *language* or *speech.*

But is it also used, by extension, to mean *nation, family*, or *population?* So truly is this the case, that the Slavonic of the first line of

the quotation from Nestor * runs, "Ot sichzke lxx i dwn *jazyku* byst *jazyk* Slovenesk,"= From such lxx and two *tongues* is the Slovenian *tongue*.

The Bohemians and Moravians call themselves *Czechsky Gazyk* and *Moravsky Gazyk* respectively.

As this may † safely be considered to be the *Jazyg-* in *Jazyg-es*, it is a sound inference to presume the existence of a Slavonic population whenever that name occurs.

[10] *Dacis.*]—Ancient Dacia comprises the modern principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia; and it is these two countries which more strongly remind us of the Dacia of Trajan and Decebalus. Here it is where the language of the Romans still remains; so that the present *Romany* of the Lower Danube belongs to the same philological division with the French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Grison; in other words, it is one of the daughters of the great Latin tongue.

But ancient Dacia comprised something more than Wallachia and Moldavia. All Transylvania, at least half the Banat, and at least half the rest of Hungary, belonged to it. Half-way between the Thiess and the Transylvanian boundary, runs a line of supposed Roman remains, and these most probably separated the Roman province of Dacia from the independent Jazyges Metanastæ of the Thiess.

Now this was a *political* division; but the political division does not reach far enough west. In order to bring Dacia in contact with Germania, we must make an ethnological frontier, and seek for Dacians beyond the province of Dacia. This is easily done, since the name was one of a widely-spread and only partially-conquered population. The Daci of the text—the Daci of the Germanic frontier—were what Zeuss calls the *independent* Dacians (*freie Daken*), and their locality was the Gallician side of Hungary. They are said by Pliny to have originally occupied the valley of the Tibiscus, from which they were expelled by the Jazyges.

[11] *Montibus.*]—This means the Medves Range and the northern continuation of the Bakonyer Wald, the frontier being that of the Germans and *Dacians*, rather than that of the Germans and *Sarmatæ*.

[12] *Alpium.*]—Varieties of form—Ἄλϐια, Stephanus Byzantinus; Ὄλϐια, Phavorinus; Σάλπια, Lycophron.

* *Prolegom.*, p. xxiii. † For a shade of doubt on the point, see *Epilegom.*, § *Siculi.*

Origin of the word, Keltic—the root being the root of the word *Albainn* = *Albion* = *hilly land* = *Scotland* = *Great Britain*— "Gallorum linguâ *Alpes montes alti* appellantur."—Isid. Hisp., Or. xiv. 8.

[13] *Abnoba.*]—This name is *perhaps* Keltic, = *ben* + *abh*, = *head of the waters.* The etymology, however, is but a guess, and nothing depends upon it.

One of the names of the forest of the Mons Abnoba was *Silva Marciana, the forest of the March,* a name very illustrative of the extent to which the *agri Decumates* was a *debatable land.*

[14] *Plures populos.*]—In the eyes of the cotemporaries of Tacitus, the groups of population along the line of the Danube were—beginning at its source—as follows:

1. *The occupants of the Decumates agri,* on both sides.

2. *The Vindelicians or Northern Rhæti,* on the south. On the north, the Southern Germans.

3. *Noricum* = Upper and Lower Austria, on the south. On the north, certain Marcomanni (?).

4. *Pannonia,* on the south; on the north, the country of the *Quadi.* The direction now changes, as we have reached the great bend, so that instead of saying the *north* and *south,* it is convenient to say the *right* and *left* banks.

5. Pannonia continued, on the right; the country of the *Jazyges* and western Daci, on the left.

6, 7. The *Mœsias* (*Superior* and *Inferior*), on the right; *Dacia,* on the left.

These coincide with the present countries of

1. Baden and Wurtemburg = the Decumates agri.

2. Bavaria = Vindelicia and South Germania.

3. Upper and Lower Austria = Noricum.

4, 5. Upper Hungary = Pannonia and the country of the Quadi and Jazyges.

6, 7. Servia and Bulgaria = the Mœsias; Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bessarabia (?) = Dacia.

Ethnologically, I believe, the whole river to have been unequally divided between the three great stocks so often mentioned already—the Kelts, the Germans, and the Sarmatians, with a few Turks and Ugrians towards its mouth. But the proof of this, as well as the details, are to be collected from the Notes in general.

II. Ipsos Germanos indigenas crediderim, miniméque aliarum gentium adventibus et hospitiis mixtos: quia nec terrâ olim, sed classibus advehebantur, qui mutare sedes quærebant;[1] et immensus ultrà, utque sic dixerim, adversus Oceanus raris ab orbe nostro navibus aditur. Quis porrò, præter periculum horridi et ignoti maris, Asiâ aut Africâ aut Italiâ relictâ, Germaniam peteret? informem terris, asperam cœlo, tristem cultu aspectuque, nisi si patria sit. Celebrant carminibus[2] antiquis (quod unum apud illos memoriæ et annalium genus est) "Tuistonem[3] deum terrâ editum, et filium Mannum,[4] originem gentis conditoresque. Manno tres filios adsignant, e quorum nominibus proximi Oceano Ingævones,[5] medii Hermiones,[6] ceteri Istævones[7] vocentur." Quidam autem licentiâ vetustatis, "plures deo ortos, pluresque gentis appellationes, Marsos,[8] Gambrivios,[9] Suevos,[10] Vandalios[11] adfirmant: "eaque vera et antiqua nomina. Ceterùm Germaniæ vocabulum recens[12] et nuper additum: quoniam qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint, ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paullatim, ut omnes primùm a victore ob metum, mox a seipsis invento nomine, Germani vocarentur." "Fuisse apud eos et Herculem"[13] memorant, primumque omnium virorum fortium ituri in prœlia canunt.

NOTES ON SECTION II.

[1] *Nec terrâ olim, sed classibus advehebantur, qui mutare sedes quærebant.*]—This appears at first to be the remark of a Greek rather than of a Roman writer; the induction upon which it rests being supplied from the maritime enterprises of the Greeks and Carthaginians. But, in truth, it is a statement of great import and generality; of an import and generality probably scarcely appreciated by Tacitus himself, and certainly unappreciated by the majority of his

commentators, as well as by writers on history and ethnology in general.

Far too many inquirers either adopt or acquiesce in the current notion that *migrations* are phenomena, which we may assume to any extent required, not only on account of the facts demanding explanation, but in order to sustain the accuracy of even indifferent authors. To such, it is as easy to bring a population from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, across a whole series of hostile countries, as to move a knight across a chess-board. The great name of Niebuhr justifies this gratuitous prodigality of locomotion. Nay more, it seems so philosophic to trace a so-called national movement to its primary cause, that a known invasion in one quarter is often supposed to justify the assumption of an unknown one elsewhere—so that nations press each other forwards, themselves being pressed upon. This doctrine, with metaphors and illustrations to match, is plausible enough to be widely recognised.

It means, in its naked form, that A attacks B, because he cannot support himself against C, C being similarly situated in respect to D, and so on; a view which makes the great qualification for the attack of another nation's country, the inability to defend one's own.

This doctrine we would gladly believe to be true. It would diminish by nine-tenths the crimes of the warlike part of the human species. It would reduce all but the first primary movements to a matter of necessity, and so justify them. The motives for aggression would not be envy, cruelty, and cupidity, but the unpleasant necessity of choosing between reparation for what has been lost to yourself by the appropriation of what belongs to another, and death or bondage.

A little analysis, and a few distinctions, will show that, instead of migrations being thus common, they are eminently rare.

A *migration* is different from a mere extension of frontier. No one says, that when the whole American population presses westwards, at the rate of (say) twelve miles a year, there is a migration. The frontier has been advanced; the advancing population being *continuous* with the stationary, and no separation of one portion of the American population from another having taken place. The Russians are gradually encroaching upon the Siberians; and the English on the Welsh; yet none of these are instances of migration.

A *migration* is different from a return, or *re*-migration. No

one would call the retreat of the ten thousand Greeks a *migration* in the usual sense of the term.

In order to even approach the idea of a true migration, there must be a *fresh country;* and there must be a *discontinuity of area* as well. In other words, a migration implies the occupation of one area by the inhabitants of another, combined with the *non-occupation of the intervening parts.* Without this latter element, it is a mere extension of frontier. To apply an illustration already made, a migration is like the *knight's move* at chess.

If these *intervening parts* be portions of the ocean, or a river, their non-occupation is a matter of course; and hence, migrations by water are common. If, however, they be by *land,* they are so rare that, *throughout the whole history of the German stock, I know no unexceptionable instance of one.*

Alsatia, Franche-Comté, Burgundy, Switzerland, and France (so far as it is German), became Germanized by *extension of frontier.*

By *extension of frontier* the Slavonic tribes were displaced.

Theodoric's conquest of Rome was as little a *migration* as the seizure of the empire by the hands of any commander in Pannonia would have been. It was a mere military occupation.

The Anglo-Saxon migration was by *sea;* and that the Gothic invasions of Alaric and others were the same, is highly probable. The Goths themselves, probably, reached Mœsia by navigating the Danube.

For a migration to be *unexceptionable,* the evidence of its occurrence must be *unexceptionable* also; *i.e.,* it must be referable to contemporary testimony. This is because migration was as favorite a mode of accounting for the more irregular distributions of population with ancient writers as it is with modern.

The difference between migrations and great military movements is difficult to draw. If, however, we choose to distinguish between an army with a number of camp-followers, and a migration properly so-called, by considering that the presence of females, aged men, and children, is necessary to constitute the latter (making it a movement, πανδημεί) the rarity of this presumedly common phenomenon is indefinitely enhanced—so much so, that a land migration (as distinguished from one by water), a migration with separation from the original area (as distinguished from mere advance of frontier), a migration to a fresh land (as distinguished from a return), and a migration πανδημεί (as distinguished from a multitudinous army)

is an occurrence of which the whole range of history gives us no undoubted instance.

Even the approaches to this are not numerous; the most remarkable of these being the Helvetic, as described by Cæsar, and the Majiar, of the ninth century, by which Hungary was peopled by Ugrians. Nevertheless, the former, as far as we follow it, was a mere advance of frontier, and the latter a military conquest.

[2] *Carminibus.*]—The earliest verses in any Gothic languages are the older poems of the Anglo-Saxons; indeed, with the exception of the Gospels of Ulphilas, and a few other fragments of the Mœso-Gothic, referable to the fourth and fifth centuries, the oldest specimens of any Gothic tongue, in any shape whatever—prose or verse—are to be found in that dialect. In the Mœso-Gothic, nothing is extant but prose.

These poems must be considered in respect to their *form* and their *subject*.

a. The form.—Judging from the earliest poems that have come down to us, poems which there is no good reason for believing were essentially different from those of the time of Tacitus, the metre was *alliterative.* There was *accent,* and there was the *recurrence of similar sounds within certain periods;* but there was no *quantity,* as in the Latin and Greek, and no *rhyme,* as in the English, German, and French. The rule was that within the space of one long or two short lines, two or more accented initial syllables should begin with the same letter.

All the vowels were considered as identical; so that three words beginning with *a, e,* or *u* respectively, would all be considered as beginning with *a,* and stand in alliteration to each other. The following extract is from the beginning of Beowulf, a poem of considerable antiquity, and known as the longest specimen of the Anglo-Saxon heroic narrative. The alliterative syllables are in Italics.

HWÆT we *G*ár-Dena	What we of Gár-Danes
in *g*ear-dagum,	In yore-days,
þeód-cýninga,	Of people-kings
þrým ge-frunon—	Glory have heard—
hú ðа *æ*þelingas	How the Æthelings
*e*llen fremedon—	Power advanced—
oft *Sc*ýld *Sc*efing,	Of Scyld Scefing.

*sc*eaþen(a) þreátum,	To the hosts of enemies (scathers).
*m*onegu *m*ægþum,	To many tribes,
*m*eodo-setla of-teáh—	The mead-settle pulled (them) off.
*e*gsode *e*orl—	The earl terrified,
sýððan *ǽ*rest wearð	Since he first was
*f*eá-sceaft *f*unden ;	An outcast found.
he þæs *f*rófre ge-bá(d),	He therefore joyful abided,
*w*eóx under *w*olcnum,	Waxed under welkin,
*w*eorð-mýndum þáh ;	With worth-memorials throve.
oð ꝥ him *ǽ*g-hwylc	Till him each
þára *y*mb-sittendra,	Of them around-sitting
ofer *h*ron-ráde,	Over the whale-road,
*h*ýran scolde,	Hear should,
*g*omban *g*ýldan—	Tribute pay.

b. The subject.—In the early poems alluded to, the subject is what the present statement of Tacitus leads us to expect. The deeds of great warriors are narrated, and the poems approach the character of epics. Beowulf, the poem last quoted, contains upwards of seven thousand lines. Its hero is an Angle; whose exploits are battles against both men and monsters, involving no small amount of supernatural agency. Hence, it is mythological rather than historical. The chief localities are the fen-districts of Hanover and Sleswick-Holstein, on the Saxon, Frisian, and Danish frontiers. Of England there is no mention. Hence, although the dialect is Anglo-Saxon, it must be considered as exhibiting those Hanoverian Saxons who took no part in the English migration. Again—although, in the form in which it has come down to us, there are several passages which prove the latest transcriber to have been a Christian, the *nucleus* of the poem is referable to the times of German paganism. Lastly; it contains several so-called episodes. Of course, these may be looked upon as integral parts of the original poem—just like the episode of Sin and Death in the Paradise Lost. Nevertheless, the more probable view is that they are smaller poems, out of which the longer epic has been subsequently constructed—rhapsodically.

The Battle of Finnesburh is a fragment, and has the appearance of referring to a real historical event more than Beowulf. This is also, to all appearances, Hanoverian.

In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the entry under A.D. 937, instead of being a statement in prose is a poem of considerable length,

known under the title of The Battle of Brunanburg. Many other such poetical extracts could be added from either the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, or from the Heimskringla of Snorro Sturleson, in Icelandic. Sometimes they stand as authorities: sometimes they replace the prose narrative.

Such are some of the poems whose form and contents most help us to realize the nature of those older records to which Tacitus alludes.

But there are other sources besides. After the great and permanent conquests of such sovereigns as Theodoric and Alboin, Gothic historians who wrote in Latin, investigated the old poems and traditions of their nation; and, although these poems and traditions in their original forms are lost, the matter of them may be found in more than one writer of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries. Of these the most famous are *Jornandes* and *Paulus Diaconus*, one for the Goths of the East in the sixth, the other for the Lombards in the eighth centuries.—See *Epilegomena.*

Again — in the old laws traces of metrical expression may be found.

Lastly, the numerous poetical narratives of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries contain, amongst many other heterogeneous elements, both in the way of tradition and mythology, much that is both indigenous and ancient.

Nevertheless, the difficulty of reconstructing the traditions of the time of Tacitus are great and, perhaps, insuperable. We are fortunate in approaching a distinct conception of them so nearly as we do.

[3] *Tuistonem.*]—All the statements that I can make concerning the deity are negative.

He appears in a definite, unequivocal shape nowhere amongst any of the Germanic or Saxon forms of heathendom: nor yet in the Edda.

So exclusively does the notice of him begin and end with Tacitus, that it looks as if either the German creeds had changed between the second and fifth centuries, or as if the Germans of Tacitus were not the Germans of subsequent history. I do not say that either of these alternatives was the case. I make the remark chiefly for the sake of showing the difference between what we learn from Tacitus and what we learn elsewhere, in the way of Gothic mythology.

Another reading is *Tuisco.* Perhaps it is the best. It certainly

gives us a more Germanic form; since, by supposing the *-isk* to be the adjectival ending preserved down to our own times in words like self-*ish*, we have a truly Gothic termination. Yet this is but little. *Tu-isco*, if dealt with as an adjective derived from a simpler form *Tu-*, would still leave a difficulty: since it is not likely that the name of a deity would be given in an adjectival form — *i.e.*, as an epithet rather than as substantive name. Who ever heard of the Greeks worshipping Ἄρειος (instead of Ἄρης), or of the Romans considering *Martialis* (rather than *Mars*) as their founder's father? Precisely the same is the unlikelihood of *Tuis-c-o* being an adjective.

For this reading, however, Zeuss argues strongly; and I draw attention to his reasoning for the sake of objecting to it. It is clear, that, when we say that such or such a form is the right reading, because it gives us certain results, and then that those results are to be admitted because such or such a reading is to be found, we argue in a circle. The reading must stand on its own proper grounds, *i.e.*, the value and number of the MSS. wherein it occurs. To correct it on the strength of anything inferred from the correction itself is illegitimate. Yet this is nearly always the case with the commentators on the *Germania*, *e.g.*, in the case of the word in question, Zeuss writes thus: "Tuisco (Tuisto is the wrong reading), which is better with the vowel transposed (Tiusco), is in respect to its derivation like *Cheru-sci*, and is in the same relation to Tiu (= deus) as the later form *mannisco*, *mennisco* or *mensch* is to the older *mann*."—P. 72.

Surely, instead of this bare statement, the collation of the MSS. should have been laid before the reader.

To such high authorities then as Zeuss, the adjectival form of a deity's name is no objection. Neither does it seem to be so to Grimm, who, consequently, takes *Tui-sco* as the reading, and *Ty-* as the root. This latter is thus declined in the Norse of the Edda.

Nom. *Ty-r*. Gen. *Ty-s*. Acc. *Ty*.

The Old High German form is *Ziu*, and the Anglo-Saxon *Tiw*. This is the deity that gives its name to *Tue-s-day*.

By carrying out this view we make *Ziu*=*Tiu*=*Tiv*=*Div*, the root in *div-us;* thus connecting the classical and Gothic mythologies. —D. M. *ad voc.*

[4] *Mannum.*]—All that applies to the word Tuisto (or Tuisco),

applies to the root *Mann-*, also. It belongs to the German mythology, as explained to the informants of Tacitus. It is foreign to it in all its later and more specific forms.

At the same time, the criticism which gets over the difficulties presented by the one name grapples with those that attend the other. Hence, *Mannus=man*, and denotes humanity; even as *Ty=Tiv=Div-* denotes *div-inity*.

[5] *Ingævones.*]—In the Anglo-Saxon poem of Beowulf we find these lines—

Ing wæs ærest	*Ing.* was first (erst)
Mid East-denum	With (the) East-Dene
Gesewen secgum;	Seen men;
Oð he siððan éast	Until he afterwards (since) eastward
Ofer væg gevat.	Over (the) wave went.
Þus Heardingas	Thus (the) Heardings
Þone hæle nemdon.	The man named.

ll. 779—787.

Again—Freyr, one of the Eddaic deities, is called *Ingvi*-Freyr.

Thirdly—the root re-appears in several proper names; *e.g.* in *Ing-uiomerus*,—the older form of *Hincmar*.

Lastly—one of the heroic royal families of Sweden is *Yng-ling-ar*, or *descendants* of *Ingvi*; *ar* being the sign of the plural number, and *ing*, like -ιδης in Greek, a patronymic form.

Beyond this, nothing in any later writer or record illustrates the term *Ing-ævones.*

[6] *Hermiones.*]—In numerous Old German and Norse compounds the element *-rm-n* is found as a prefix; its power being to convey the notion of *vastness*, *antiquity*, or some similar reverential idea. Thus *Irmin-diot=the human kind; Iormund-adr=the great serpent.*

More famous still was the *Irmin-sûl* of the Old Saxons of Westphalia; a pillar or column embodying to the last the superstitions of the nation, and, finally, destroyed by Charlemagne.

Again—the word *Hermunduri*, as applied to certain Germans of the south-east, is a similar compound.

Lastly—the names *Arminius=Herman* contain the same fundamental sounds.

Beyond this nothing in any later writer illustrates the term Hermiones.

7 *Istævones.*]—Here the reading is doubtful, *Iscævones* being another form.

The existence of an heroic (or semi-heroic) family called *Astings*, gives us the nearest approach to the illustration for the former; the root *Ask*, in *Ascipurgium*, for the latter. See *not. ad v.*

It may safely be said that the *carmina antiqua* that explain any part of the mythology in a satisfactory form, are as thoroughly lost as the mythology which suggested the *carmina antiqua*.

8 *Marsos.*]—The locality of the Marsi was the country about *Essen*, in Westphalia.—See *Epilegomena*, § *Chattuarii.*

9 *Gambrivios.*]—What applies to the Marsi applies to the Gambrivii also; to which it may be added, that the *Gambr-* in this latter word is, in the opinion of Zeuss, the *-gambr-* in *Si-cambr-i.*

For further notice, see *Epilegomena* v. *Sicambri.*

10 *Suevos.*]—See *Epilegomena* in v.

11 *Vandalios.*]—See *Epilegomena* in v.

12 *Germaniæ vocabulum recens.*]—This and note I. 1. are complementary to each other.

Notwithstanding the words *a seipsis invento nomine*, I believe that the word *German* was as foreign to the ancient Germans, as the word *Welsh* is to a Cambro-Briton. The natives of the principality, as is well known, call themselves *Cumraig*. *Welsh*, is what they are called by their neighbours.

From Tacitus's own evidence, the name is *new*. This, which is *primâ facie* evidence of its *not* being native, is conclusive as to the fact of their having *originally* had no collective designation.

The particular portion of the Germanic population which crossed the Rhine, had *two* names,—*Tungri* and *Germani.* Tacitus explains this by assuming a difference of *time*,—one appellation being old, the other recent. I know no instance of such a change. The real fact seems to have been, that *Tungri* was the *native*, *Germani* the *Gallic* name for one and the same people,—just like *Welsh* and *Cumraig*, *Englishman* and *Sassenach*.

The extension of the designation of a particular tribe, family, or nation, to a whole stock, is well illustrated by the word *Græcia*.

Small and unimportant,—possibly even non-Hellenic—as the little Epirote tribe of the *Græci* was, it was they who gave the Roman name to *Hellas*.

[13] *Herculem.*]—See Notes, ix. 3.

III. Sunt illis hæc quoque carmina, quorum relatu, quem Barditum[1] vocant, accendunt animos, futuræque pugnæ fortunam ipso cantu augurantur; terrent enim, trepidantve, prout sonuit acies. Nec tam voces illæ, quàm virtutis concentus videntur: adfectatur præcipuè asperitas soni, et fractum murmur, objectis ad os scutis, quò plenior et gravior vox repercussu intumescat. Ceterùm et "Ulixem" quidam opinantur, "longo illo et fabuloso errore in hunc Oceanum delatum, adisse Germaniæ terras, Asciburgiumque, quod in ripâ Rheni situm, hodieque incolitur, ab illo constitutum, nominatumque ΑΣΚΙΠΥΡΓΟΙΝ.[2] Aram quinetiam Ulixi consecratam, adjecto Laertæ patris nomine, eodem loco, olim repertam: monumentaque, et tumulos quosdam, Græcis literis inscriptos, in confinio Germaniæ Rhætiæque adhuc exstare," quæ neque confirmare argumentis, neque refellere in animo est: ex ingenio suo quisque demat vel addat fidem.

NOTES ON SECTION III.

[1] *Barditum.*]—The usual name of the *poet* in the Germanic tongues was *scôp;* in the Scandinavian *skald.* No such root as *bard* occurs; and no derivatives of it are known.

It is to the Keltic languages that it belongs, and is so foreign to all the Gothic that, notwithstanding the words *barditum vocant,* I cannot believe that any German ever so designated either his national songs, or his national music. That they had much in common with

those of the Gauls is credible; but that the *name* was the same is unlikely. In the present case, then, Tacitus describes a German custom by a Gallic name. That his error goes thus far I believe. I do not, however, believe that it goes farther; in other words, I do not think that the *practice* which he describes is so Gallic as not to be Germanic also; or that he has confused the custom as well as misapplied the term.

At the same time there is another view which may be taken. It is just possible that Gallic bards might have formed part of the retinue of certain German chiefs; in which case they may have been called by their employers by the name they bore at home. However, the national character of their functions, consisting as it did of the recital of *native* poems, is against this.

Lastly—if a reasonable interpretation of the root *b-rd-*, can be obtained from any Gothic tongue, all objections against the present statement falls to the ground.

At present, however, it is best explained by assuming the fallibility of the author in which it occurs.

Lucan's notice of the bardic poetry and doctrine is as follows:—

Vos quoque qui fortes animas, belloque peremptas
Laudibus in longum vates dimittitis ævum,
Plurima securi fudistis carmina Bardi.
Et vos barbaricos ritus, moremque sinistrum
Sacrorum Druidæ positis repetistis ab armis.
Solis nôsse deos, et cœli numina vobis,
Aut solis nescire datum est; nemora alta remotis
Incolitis lucis: vobis auctoribus, umbræ
Non tacitas Erebi sedes, Ditisque profundi
Pallida regna petunt; regit idem spiritus artus
Orbe alio; longæ, canitis si cognita, vitæ
Mors media est. Certe populi quos despicit Arctos,
Felices errore suo, quos ille timorum
Maximus, haud urget leti metus; inde ruendi
In ferrum mens prona viris, animæque capaces
Mortis, et ignavum rediture parcere vitæ.

Pharsal. i. 447—462.

In Lithuanic the root *b-rt* appears with the meaning of *seer*, or *fortune-teller*.

[2] ΑΣΚΙΠΥΡΓΙΟΝ.—In German *burg*=*town*, *berg*=*hill*, *ge-birg-e* =*range of hills*.

As the reading here is ΠΥΡΓ- (a reading which we must take as we find it) the first of these three meanings must be the one admitted in the first instance.

Ask, on the other hand, is the English word *ash*, a prefix which applies better to a *hill* than to a *town*. This modifies our view, and supplies a reason for believing that ΠΕΡΓ- would have been the truer affix. Perhaps the analogy of πύργος misled the classical writers.

That the notion that *-purg* stands for what would more correctly have been *-perg*, is by no means gratuitous, is shown by the following cases:—

a. The wooded range of the Westphalian hills is called *Saltus Teuto*burg*iensis*, not *Teuto*berg*iensis*.

b. A similarly wooded range on the east side of Bohemia (the *Riesegebirge*) is called by Ptolemy Ἀσκιϐουργίου ὄρος.

The use of *p* for *b* is a Bavarianism, and suggests the likelihood of the form in question being of Alemannic origin.

Probably the true name was *Ask-kipirki*=*Ash-tree Mountains*.

The comparative absence of towns in Germany favours the idea of the *u* being incorrect.

A long list of words in Zeuss shows the extent to which the *ash* entered into the names of topographical localities—*Ask-i-tuna*, *Asc-a-brunno*, *Asc-feld*, *Asch-a-bach*, &c.

In the Eddaic mythology too it is important.

a. According to one account *Ash* and *Elm* (*Askr* and *Embla*) were the first human beings.

b. The great tree which stood central to the universe was the *Ash Ygdrasil*—the tree of Time, at the root of which gnawed the serpent Nidhögg, whilst up and down ran the squirrel Ratatoska.

Such are the unconnected elements of one interpretation—elements to which no one hitherto has given cohesion.

Another series lies in the word *Asgard*.

In the Eddaic mythology the *Asas* are the *dii majores*: whilst *gard* means *house* =*gaard* in Danish. Hence *As-gard* = *the habitation of the Asas*; a Scandinavian Olympus opposed to *Middangard* the *Middle-gore*, or the *home of man*.

It has been thought that the *As-* in *Askipurgion* is the *As-* in

As-gard; meaning, consequently, *Asas.* If so, ΑΣΚΙΠΥΡΓΙΟΝ is *the town of the gods.*

The reader will probably prefer the physical to the mythological interpretation—even if he be dissatisfied with both.

Upon the names *Ulixes* and *Laertes,* I can throw no light and suggest nothing satisfactory.

IV. Ipse eorum opinionibus accedo, qui "Germaniæ populos nullis aliis aliarum nationum connubiis infectos, propriam et sinceram et tantùm suî similem gentem exstitisse" arbitrantur. Unde habitus quoque corporum,[1] quamquam in tanto hominum numero, idem omnibus: truces et cærulei oculi, rutilæ comæ, magna corpora, et tantùm ad impetum valida; laboris atque operum non eadem patientia: miniméque sitim æstumque tolerare, frigora atque inediam cœlo solove adsueverunt.

NOTE ON SECTION IV.

[1] *Habitus—corporum.*]—This uniformity of physical appearance by no means characterizes the present Germans. That the average height is greater than that of the Italians, that extremely black hair and eyes is rarer than in the south of Europe, and that red hair and freckles, and a ruddy complexíon with blue or grey eyes, and flaxen hair are also commoner, is as much as can safely be said.

These are in different proportions in different parts of the Germanic (or Gothic) area. In Friesland and Sweden they are, perhaps, the most common.

At the same time, the description of Tacitus is no over-statement; since we must not only remember that he wrote as an Italian, accustomed to dark skins and black hair, but that, since his time, three important influences have been at work upon the Germanic constitution.

a. Increased civilization.

b. Increased intermixture with foreign nations.

c. Extension of area from Germany to Britain, from Britain to America: to say nothing of the minor extensions within the limits of Europe.

Lastly, it should be added that the Germans of the Lower Rhine, and Westphalia, the Frisians, and Cheruscans, were the sections of the population which Tacitus has described most in detail. Now these, to judge from the present occupants of the parts in question, were amongst the most typical of their stock.

V. Terra, etsi aliquantò specie differt, in universum tamen aut silvis horrida aut paludibus fœda:[1] humidior quà Gallias, ventosior quà Noricum ac Pannoniam aspicit: satis ferax, frugiferarum arborum impatiens, pecorum fecunda, sed plerumque improcera: ne armentis quidem suus honor, aut gloria frontis: numero gaudent: eæque solæ et gratissimæ[2] opes sunt. Argentum et aurum propitii an irati dii negaverint, dubito. Nec tamen adfirmaverim, nullam Germaniæ venam argentum aurumve gignere: quis enim scrutatus est? possessione et usu haud perinde adficiuntur. Est videre apud illos argentea vasa, legatis et principibus eorum muneri data, non in aliâ vilitate, quàm quæ humo finguntur: quamquam proximi ob usum commerciorum aurum et argentum in pretio habent, formasque quasdam nostræ pecuniæ agnoscunt, atque eligunt: interiores simpliciùs et antiquiùs permutatione mercium utuntur. Pecuniam probant veterem et diu notam, Serratos, Bigatosque.[3] Argentum quoque magis quàm aurum sequuntur, nullâ affectione animi, sed quia numerus argenteorum facilior usui est promiscua ac vilia mercantibus.

---

[1] *Silvis horrida aut paludibus fœda.*]—The ethnological distribution of the Germanic population over these two divisions of country was—

a. For the *forest* districts—the ancestors of the Mœso-Goths and the High Germans; their area being Thuringia, Suabia, Franconia, Hesse.

b. For the *fen-districts*—the Frisians proper and the Chauci.

c. Divided between the two—the Old Saxons and some of the Low Germans; the Westerwald (*saltus Teutoburgiensis*) being within their limits.

Of the two representatives of these two physical divisions, the extreme types were, perhaps, the Franconians and Frieslanders.

An important modification of the country, however, is not comprehended within these two denominations, *i.e.* the sandy heaths and barrens of Hanover; indeed, as they lay beyond the area habitually traversed by the Romans, they were, probably, unknown to Tacitus. These, when they attain their maximum of elevation and sterility—as is the case with the Lüneburg Heath—have been allowed to constitute the nearest approach to be found in Europe of the *Steppe*, so characteristic of Central and Northern Asia.

The population that most closely coincided with this division, as far as it was German at all (and not Slavonic), was the Anglo-Saxon.

[2] *Eæ opes sunt.*]—That the German cattle was almost wholly *kine* and *oxen* (to the comparative exclusion of *sheep*) is the natural inference from the absence of the word *greges*, and the prominence given to *armentis*; an inference strengthened by the notice of the German dress, the materials of which were either *flaxen* or *leathern*; no mention being made of *wool*.

Again, it is a remark of Mr. Garnett's, that, in the present English, the words connected with the arts of *weaving* and *spinning* are Keltic rather than Germanic; *e.g.*,

English.	Welsh.
Clout	Clwt.
Gussett	Cwysed.
Darn	Darn.
Welt	Gwald.
Gown	Gwn.
Mesh	Masg.
Rug	Rhuwch.

[3] *Serratos, Bigatosque.*] — The *serrated* margin of the ancient coins ensured them against being clipped, and showed the extent to which they had been worn.

Any coin might be *serratus*. On the other hand, those which were marked with the *biga* (or *quadriga*) were exclusively silver—so that *serratus* applies to the pattern of the coinage, *bigatus* to the material.—See Facciolat. in vv.

VI. Ne ferrum quidem superest,[1] sicut ex genere telorum colligitur. Rari gladiis, aut majoribus lanceis utuntur: hastas, vel ipsorum vocabulo frameas[2] gerunt, angusto et brevi ferro; set ita acri et ad usum habili, ut eodem telo, prout ratio poscit, vel cominus vel eminus pugnent: et eques quidem scuto frameâque contentus est: pedites et missilia spargunt, pluraque singuli, atque in immensum vibrant, nudi aut sagulo leves: nulla cultûs jactatio: scuta tantùm lectissimis coloribus distinguunt: paucis loricæ: vix uni alterive cassis, aut galea. Equi non formâ, non velocitate conspicui: sed nec variare gyros, in morem nostrum, docentur. In rectum aut uno flexu dextros agunt, ita conjuncto orbe, ut nemo posterior sit. In universum æstimanti, plus penes peditem roboris: eoque mixti prœliantur, aptâ et congruente ad equestrem pugnam velocitate peditum, quos ex omni juventute delectos ante aciem locant. Definitur et numerus: centeni ex singulis pagis sunt: idque ipsum inter suos vocantur: et quod primò numerus fuit, jam nomen et honor[3] est. Acies per cuneos componitur. Cedere loco, dummodo rursus instes, consilii quàm formidinis arbitrantur. Corpora suorum etiam in dubiis prœliis referunt. Scutum reliquisse præcipuum flagitium: nec aut sacris adesse, aut con-

cilium inire ignominioso fas: multique superstites bellorum, infamiam laqueo finierunt.

NOTES ON SECTION VI.

[1] *Ne ferrum quidem superest.*]—The statement as to the rarity of metal must be limited to being evidence only to the non-existence of mining habits and the metallurgic arts, in ancient Germany. Grimm, who has given the following table of the names of the metals in different languages, remarks that the names for *gold* and *silver* agree in the German and Slavonic tongues, but not in the Keltic. This latter coinciding with the Latin.

For *brass* and *iron* the German and Latin agree.

The Ugrian tongues, where they have not borrowed from the so-called Indo-European languages, have a wholly different set of roots.

ENGLISH	BRASS	GOLD	SILVER	IRON.
Greek	χαλκός	χρυσός	ἄργυρος	σίδηρος.
Latin	æs *	aurum	argentum	ferrum.
Italian	bronzo	oro	argento	ferro.
Spanish	bronze	oro	argen	hierro.
Romane	irom	or	argent	fer.
Walachian	aram	—	ardshint	fier.
Albanian	ζίλι	ἄῤῥ	ἐργίντ	χεκούρι.
Gaelic	umha	or	airgjod	jaran.
Welsh	—	aur	arian	haiarn.
Armorican	—	aour	argan	houarn.
Basque	urraida	urrea	cilarra	burdina.
Prussian	—	ausis	sirablas	—
Lithuanic	waras	auksas	sirabias	gelezis.
Lettish	warseh	selts	sudrabs	dselse.
Slavonic	bron	zlato	srebro	sheljezo.
Russian	bronza	zoloto	serebro	sheljezo.
Polish	broc	zloto	srebro	zelazo.
Bohemian	ruda	zlato	strjbro	zelezo.
Wend	ruda	zloto	sljebro	zelezo.
Mœso-Gothic	ais	gulp	silubr	eisarn.
Old High German	êr	kold	silapar	isarn.
M. High German	erz	gold	silber	eisen.
Anglo-Saxon	âr	gold	seolfor	îsern.
English	ore	gold	silver	iron.

* Also *raudus.*

ENGLISH	BRASS	GOLD	SILVER	IRON.
Dutch	koper	goud	zilver	ijzer.
Icelandic	eir	gull	silfr	iarn.
Swedish	koppar	guld	silfver	järn.
Danish	kobber	guld	solv	jern.
Finn	kasari *	kulda	hopia	rauta.
Esthonian	werren †	kuld	höbbe	raud.
Laplandic	air	golle	silb	roude.
Majiar	ertz	arany	ezüst	vas.

To verify the doctrine that the coincidences in the names of the metals are as they are stated to be, a few considerable, but by no means unreasonable, letter-changes are assumed. Thus—

1. *Æs*, *ais*, *âr*, *ore* and *eir* are the same words; the change from *s* to *r* being verified by the oblique cases of the Latin language itself—Nom. *æs*, Gen. *ær-is*.

2. The identification of the Slavonic root *z-l-t* with the Gothic *g-l-d* is also legitimate; since the change from *g* or *k* to a sibilant is usual—*καρδ-*=*heart*=*szird-*, in Lithuanic.

3. The Spanish *hierro* explains the loss of the *f-* in *ferrum*, as compared with *jern* and *iron*.

Copper seems to be an exclusively German root; and copper is the metal which, from being earliest worked, is earliest used.

In Gothic archæology it is well known that the so-called *metallic* age is separated from the so-called *ante-metallic* by a broad line of demarcation; the series of facts upon which the distinction rests being as follows:—

a. In certain graves, *tumuli* or barrows, the implements found along with the body, are of *bone* or *stone*, wood or leather, to the exclusion of metal of any kind.

b. In others, they are of *gold* or *silver*, to the exclusion of iron or bronze.

c. In others, of *iron* or *bronze*, as well as the more precious metals.

The general doctrine is, that the third class of graves are the *newest*, the first the *oldest*; and, upon this doctrine, a considerable number of archæological and ethnological generalizations have been founded; the civilization (or want of civilization) of the period anterior to the practice of metallurgy being contrasted with that which arose out of the introduction of that art. One of the more important hypotheses connected with this distinction has been so

* Also *vaski*. † Also *wask*.

generally adopted, and so elaborately worked out by the geologists, naturalists, and philologists of Scandinavia — Eschricht, Nilson, Retzius, Keyser, and others—as to have become almost characteristic of their school. It rests upon the belief that the *skulls* of the *skeletons* of the oldest burial-places, approach in form those of the Lapps, Finns, and Ugrians in general: those of the newer ones only agreeing with those of the present Germans. Assuming the truth of this view (and, without adopting it implicitly, I am not prepared to deny it) we have a means of ascertaining the character of the earliest populations, not only of Germany and Scandinavia, but of many other countries besides—the reasoning running thus—

1. The antiquity of the grave may be ascertained by the nature of the implements and ornaments interred along with the skeleton.

2. To the antiquity of the grave the skull of the person buried has a certain relation.

3. The osteological differences thus implied are best accounted for by the assumption of a change in the *stock*, *family*, or *race* of the occupants of the country.

Of the different elements in the inference drawn from this line of criticism, the latter is the most exceptionable. The *safe* position is simply the fact that the oldest skulls are the smallest in capacity. Such, at least, is the view from the following Table; taken from a fuller one in Mr. D. Wilson's valuable Archæology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland. It shows the relative proportions of a series of skulls of *very great*, with those of a series of *moderate* antiquity.

		Longitudinal diameter.	Parietal diameter.	Frontal diameter.	Vertical diameter.	Intermastoid arch.	Intermastoid arch from upper root of zygomatic process.	Intermastoid lines.	Ditto from upper root of zygomatic process.	Occipito-frontal arch.	Ditto from occipital protuberance to root of nose.	Horizontal periphery.	Relative capacity.
Very old.	1.	7·0	5·4½ ?	4·9 ?	4·10	13·11	11·5	3·6½	4·8½	13·9	12·0	20·4	32·2
	2.	7·0	4·8	4·4	5·3	13·2	11·0	4·1	4·10	14·0	11·11	19·6	31·9
	3.	6·11	5·3	3·11	5·0	...	12·0	...	4·8½	14·4	11·4	19·0	30·11
	4.	7·0	4·11	4·4	5·3	13·8	11·4½	4·1	4·10	13·10	11·3	16·7½	28·10½
	5.	6·6	4·1 ?	4·11	4·2 ?	13·2	11·3	...	4·8 ?	13·11	12·0	19·0	29·6
	6.	7·3	5·4	4·6	5·2	14·3	11 9	4·4	5·0½	14·8	12·3	20·8½	33·1½
	7.	7·5	5·2	4·5	5·2	14·3	12·0	3·7	4·10½	14·3	12·3	20·7½	33·2½
	8.	7·9	5·6	4·9	...	...	12·3	...	5·6	15·6	...	21·3	...
	9.	7·3	5·8	4·3½	4·9	14·0	11·9	3·8½	5·0	14·2	11·9	20·7	32·7
Moderately old.	17.	7·9	5·0	4·10	5·6	14·9	11·11	4·0	5·4	15·5	13·6	21·3	34·6
	18.	7·6	5·1	4·6	5·1	14·8	11·3	3·11	5·3	14·6	12·11	20·4	32·11½
	19.	7·3	5·3	4·5	5·4½	14·5	12·4	3·11½	4·9	14·9	12·9	20·10	33·5½
	20.	7·5	5·6½	5·0½	5·6	14·11½	12·3	4·0	...	14·9	12·6	20·10	33·9
	21.	7·3	5·6½	4·4	5·6	14·8	12·0	4·1	5·3	14·5	12·10	20·2	32·11
	22.	7·2	5·7	4·5	5·6	14·9	11·10	4·3	5·6	14·4	12·6	20·0	32·8
	23.	7·3½	5·7	4·6	5·2	15·0 ?	12·4 ?	...	...	14·8	12·6½	19·10½	32·4
	24.	7·2	5·5	4·6	...	...	...	...	...	...	12·10	20·7	...
	25.	7·8	5·6	4·3½	5·3	14·4	11·8	4·7	5·6	14·6	12·7	20·11	33·10
	26.	7·9	5·7	5·3	5·6	15·7	13·3	4·0½	5·4	16·4	14·4	21·11	55·2
	27.	7·11	5·5	4·9	...	...	12·0	...	5·1	15·5	13·9	21·6	...

[2] *Frameas.*]—This is a true German gloss. It means a *stabbing* rather than a *cutting* instrument; its present power being *pfriem*= *punch, awl, bodkin.* The *furze* is called *pfriemen*-kraut; the *broom*, *pfriemen*-holtz; and the *Nardus structa*, *Pfriemen*-gras.

Isidorus Hispalensis wrongly derives it from *ferramentum;* "*Framea* gladius est ex utraque parte acutus, quam vulgo *spatham* vocant. *Framea* autem dicta quia *ferrea* est, nam sicut *ferramentum* sic *framea* dicitur, ac proinde omnis gladius *framea*."—Origg. xviii. 6, 3.

It is difficult to imagine any objections to the connexion between *framea* and *pfrieme*, except such as arise out of the possibility of the modern word having been derived from the *gloss* in Tacitus—a not unreasonable doctrine. This, however, is set aside by the extent to which the word is shown by its compound, to be truly German. It is also set aside by the extent to which it appears throughout the Gothic languages — Dutch *priem*, Anglo-Saxon *preon*, Icelandic *prion*.

Objections, however, *have* been raised. The *p* is not exactly the sound which, in the eyes of the strict believers in the uniformity of letter-changes, grows out of *f*. Neither is the diphthong exactly what would be developed out of *a*. Neither is the sense exactly the same —"The diphthong varies, and the sense does so still more—der diphthong aber abweicht, und der begrif noch mehr."—D. S. i. 515.

There is no objection to this minute criticism; indeed, in and of itself, it is good. The change from *fr-* to *pfr-* is not of the most usual sort; perhaps it is unique.

Again—the *a* in *framea* is short, as shown by a line of Juvenal—

> Per Solis radios, Tarpeiaque fulmina jurat,
> Et Martis *frămeam*, et Cirrhæi spicula vatis.—Sat. xiii. 78.

And a short vowel is not the best origin to a long diphthong.

Then, as a sword *cuts*, whereas a *framea stabs*, the "sense is different."

All this is good, *if taken alone*. It is good against an etymologist who asserts that the connexion between *pfrieme* and *framea* is so undoubted and undeniable that no sane philologist can demur to it.

It is also good against any other etymology equally exceptionable or unexceptionable.

But it is not good against such an etymology as the following, followed up by the forthcoming inferences.

a. *Framea* is either a clerical error, or a mistake for *franca*.

b. *Franca* was a weapon used by the *Franks*, from whom it took its name.

I will lay before the reader all that can be said in favour of this view.

a. As admitted, the change from *fr-* to *pfr-* is not of a common kind.

b. In the old uncial MS. NC and M are often confused.

c. *France* in Anglo-Saxon, and *frakka* in Norse=*javelin*.

d. The Spaniards called *axes franciscæ* after the *Franks*—"secures—quas et Hispani ab usu *Francorum*, per derivationem *Franciscas* vocant."—Isid. Hispal. xviii. 6, 3.

Observe, that in this last case, the writer who finds an *awl*, *bodkin*, as too unlike a *dagger* to connect *pfrieme* with *framea*, finds no difficulty in connecting an *axe* with a *javelin*.

Observe, too, that *francisca*, as an adjective, can, at best, but mean the *Frankish weapon*.

Of the Anglo-Saxon and Norse forms, *france* and *frakka*, I by no means undervalue the importance.

Now let us look to the assumptions requisite for this view.

In Juvenal the word occurs, throughout the MSS., as *framea*.

In Tacitus it occurs seven times, and, throughout the MSS., as *framea*.

Surely the likelihood of the M becoming NC, as opposed to this, is only a presumption against a fact.

But the first Roman writer who, by using the word, introduced it into Rome, may have written *framea* for *franca*, and so the error have been propagated. This, I submit, is only valid against something else equally hypothetical. It is not enough to say that an author may blunder. If it were so, any man might believe or disbelieve what he chooses. The particular likelihood of each blunder must be shown.

Still the assumption may possibly be legitimate; since it is possible that the hypothesis, which arises out of them, may clear away numerous and considerable difficulties, do away with numerous and considerable improbabilities, and so gain credence on the strength of the phenomena for which it will account.

Let us see what is done in this way.

It does just the contrary to what it ought.

The *Franks*, under the name of *Frank*, appear in history, for the first time, in the *second* century—no earlier.

To have given, however, the name to a weapon, mentioned by Tacitus and Juvenal, they must have existed under that name in the *first*—existed, as it were, in a latent state, and unknown as *Franks* to the legions and commanders who conquered them. I scarcely think that this strengthens the case.

Still the derivation may be both valid and valuable. It may teach us to look for the *Franks* more closely, and, consequently, to find them earlier than is supposed.

It has done this in the case of its chief supporter. Ptolemy mentions a people called, *'Αναρτοφρακτοί*, in *Pannonia*—and these are considered to be *Φρακτοί*, or *Φραγκοί*.

But Pannonia is a long way from the Frank country. Not too far for an etymologist. They came from the East, as, in the eyes of the etymologist, all populations do.

Sigebertus Gemblacensis writes, "Francis post *Priamum, Priami* filius Marcomerus et Sunno filius Antenoris principantur annis xxxvi., quorum ducatu Franci Sicambria egressi consedere secus Rhenum in oppidis Germaniæ."

Here the force of etymology stops, for it has not hitherto gone so far as to connect *framea* with King *Priam*.

But, though all this may be wrong, there was really a relationship between the *Franks* and the *Pannonians*. Yes; Augustus planted a *Sicambrian* * legion in Hungary. No such Sicambrian colony, however, will make *'Αναρτοφρακτοί* Franks, or deduce the subjects of Clovis from the Danube, any more than our Indian possessions will make London a colony of Calcutta.

Now the previous doctrine is not the fruit of the old empirical etymology, which took no account of consonants, and looked upon vowels as nothing, but the result of those so-called iron-bound laws of letter-change, which lead their supporters to demur to deducing *pfrieme* from *framea*.

There are certain things less legitimately assumed than an unmanageable letter-change; and a migration which connects the Franks to *'Αναρτοφρακτοί* is one of them.

The doctrine exhibited above is James Grimm's.—D. S. i. 512—519.

But the change from *fr-*, to *pfr-*, is by no means a serious difficulty; since there is no proof of its ever having taken place.

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Sicambri*.

Who shall say that, although Tacitus *wrote framea*, the *sound* was not that of *pfram*? The combination of an aspirate with its own lene, although found in the classical writers, where two syllables meet, as in Γόνθοι and Σάπφω, is an impossible combination at the *beginning* of a word. Hence, if the combination which they *heard in speech*, were ever so much *pfr-*, their mode of representing it, or *spelling*, would be either *pr-* or *fr-*, as the case might be.

[3] *Nomen et honor.*]—*Viz.* the word *hundred.*—See Notes, xii. 5.

VII. Reges ex nobilitate;[1] duces[2] ex virtute sumunt. Nec regibus infinita aut libera potestas: et duces exemplo potiùs quàm imperio: si prompti, si conspicui, si ante aciem agant, admiratione præsunt. Ceterùm, neque animadvertere, neque vincire, ne verberare quidem, nisi sacerdotibus[3] permissum: non quasi in pœnam, nec ducis jussu, sed velut deo imperante, quem adesse bellantibus credunt: effigiesque, et signa quædam, detracta lucis, in prœlium ferunt. Quodque præcipuum fortitudinis incitamentum est, non casus, nec fortuita conglobatio turmam aut cuneum facit, sed familiæ et propinquitates:[4] et in proximo pignora: unde feminarum ululatus audiri, unde vagitus infantium: hi cuique sanctissimi testes, hi maximi laudatores. Ad matres, ad conjuges vulnera ferunt: nec illæ numerare, aut exigere plagas pavent. Cibosque et hortamina pugnantibus gestant.

NOTES ON SECTION VII.

[1] *Reges ex nobilitate.*]—The best measure of the extent to which the highest executive power was hereditary, is to be found in the fact of the Cherusci, after the extinction of all the royal family *within the country*, sending to Italy for a Romanized Cheruscan—a sort of Edgar Atheling, whose descent more than counterbalanced his ex-

patriation.—"Eodem anno Cheruscorum gens regem Româ petivit, amissis per interna bella nobilibus, et uno reliquo stirpis regiæ, qui apud Urbem habebatur, nomine *Italicus*. Paternum huic genus e Flavio, fratre Arminii; mater ex Catumero, principe Chattorum erat."—Ann. xi. 16. Even if we refer a great part of this to Roman intrigue—a probable assumption—the evidence that the recognition of the great element of kingly power—*descent*—was as true a characteristic of *some* of the early Germans, as the sense of personal liberty, is unexceptionable.

At the same time, it is possible that, in the more fenny and inaccessible parts of Friesland, parts less surrounded by conterminous nations, the approach to either a republican or a patriarchal government may have been closer; the East Frisians, of all the Germans, at the beginning of the period of undoubted history, being republican.

The name *Italicus* (and, besides this, there are several other instances of Germans with a Roman name) shows the extent to which certain individuals, at least, of the Germanic nation were Romanized.

The German equivalent of what Tacitus renders *rex* (or rather the German word to which Tacitus uses *rex* as an equivalent) was probably *cyning* in Anglo-Saxon, *kuninc* Old High German. How far, however, this was a derivative from the word *cyne=gen-us* (*kin*) is uncertain. The best authorities have connected the two.

[2] *Duces.*]—The German word to which *dux* stands in the same relation as *rex* does to *cyning* is uncertain. At the beginning of the literary period we find Anglo-Saxon *heretoga*, and Old High German *herizzoho* the equivalents to *dux*; and at the present day *her-zog-thum* in High German, and *her-tug-dom* in Danish mean *duke-dom*. Whether, however, the combination *h-r* + *t-g* was as old as the time of Tacitus is uncertain.

Perhaps the oldest form of our word *earl* (*eorl* Anglo-Saxon, *jarl* Norse) has a better claim—at least for the Saxons and Scandinavians.

The fact that makes the compound *h-r* + *t-g* doubtful is the possibility of the German word *-tog* having originated out of the Latin *dux* (*duc-s*).

Supposing, however, the *two* words to have existed, it is probable that the *heri-toga* found his duty on the *marches*, the *eorl* in the more central parts of the country.

[3] *Sacerdotibus.*]—The *pagan* name to what Tacitus considered *sacer-*

dos the equivalent, is difficult to ascertain. The word to which I most incline is some composition of the root *blot=litare;* perhaps *blot-man.* A Burgundian gloss *sinistus=sacerdos* has come down to us.

[4] *Familiæ et propinquitates.*]—Cæsar's term is *cognationes.*

The probable name for this was *mæg-sceaft=mate-ship,* or *sib-sceaft=sib-ship.*

The family itself was *mægð;* each member a *maga;* plural *mæg-as.* The *family-bond* was *mæg-burh.*

In Beowulf the warriors who desert their chief are told that "thenceforth they have forfeited the rights of citizenship,

> Folcrihtes sceal
> ðære mǽgburge
> monna ǽgwhilc
> idel hweorfan.

not, *each of you individually,* but *each and every man of your* kin, cognation, or mægsceaft shall be deprived of his rights of citizenship; from which we must infer that the misconduct of one person might compromise his relatives, who are held responsible for his actions."—Kemble, Saxons in England, i. 235.

VIII. Memoriæ proditur, quasdam acies inclinatas jam et labantes a feminis restitutas, constantiâ precum, et objectu pectorum, et monstratâ cominus captivitate, quam longè impatientiùs feminarum suarum nomine timent: adeò ut efficaciùs obligentur animi civitatum, quibus inter obsides puellæ quoque nobiles imperantur. Inesse quinetiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant: nec aut consilia earum aspernantur, aut responsa negligunt. Vidimus, sub divo Vespasiano, Veledam,[1] diu apud plerosque numinis loco habitam. Sed et olim Auriniam, et complures alias venerati sunt, non adulatione, nec tamquam facerent deas.

NOTE ON SECTION VIII.

[1] *Veledam.*]—"Ea virgo nationis Bructeræ, latè imperitabat, vetere apud Germanos more, quo plerasque feminarum fatidicas, et augescente superstitione, arbitrantur deas. Tuncque *Veledæ* auctoritas adolevit; nam 'prosperas Germanis res, et excidium legionum' prædixerat."— Tac. Hist. iv. 61. This was during the war against Civilis, in whose favour the influence of Veleda was exerted.

Dio Cassius associates her with a virgin named *Ganna*, placing each in the *Keltic* country:—Μάσυος δὲ, ὁ Σεμνόνων βασιλεὺς, καὶ Γάννα πάρθενος (ἣν δὲ μετὰ τὴν Βελήδαν ἐν Κελτικῇ θειάζουσα) ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Δομιτιανὸν, καὶ τιμῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ τυχόντες, ἀνεκομίσθησαν. —Lib. lxvi. 5.

This passage is valuable because it shows the probable authority upon which the notice of the customs of the Semnones (see not. in v.) is founded, *viz*: that of Masyus himself.

Of *Aurinia* no other mention is made.

IX. Deorum maximè Mercurium[1] colunt, cui certis diebus, humanis quoque hostiis[2] litare fas habent. Herculem[3] ac Martem[4] concessis animalibus placant: pars Suevorum et Isidi sacrificat.[5] Unde causa et origo peregrino sacro, parum comperi, nisi quòd signum ipsum in modum liburnæ figuratum, docet advectam religionem. Ceterùm, nec cohibere parietibus deos, neque in ullam humani oris speciem adsimulare, ex magnitudine cœlestium arbitrantur; lucos ac nemora consecrant, deorumque nominibus appellant secretum illud, quod solâ reverentiâ vident.

NOTES ON SECTION IX.

[1] *Mercurium.*]—The Latin name for the fourth day in the week is *dies Mercurii*; the English *Wednes-day.*

Wednes-day=*Wodens-day*. Of the Anglo-Saxon *Woden*, *Wuotan* was the High German, *Oþinn* the Norse form.

From the great importance of *Woden* in all the Gothic mythologies wherein he appears, and from the extent to which he appears in all that are at all known, it is likely that *Woden* was Tacitus's *Mercury*.

With Matthew of Westminster, and Geoffrey of Monmouth this was certainly the view—"Colimus maxime Mercurium, quem Wóden linguâ nostrâ appellamus." This is, probably, from Tacitus.

As both writers, however, lived subsequently to the name of Wednesday being given to the fourth day of the week, they scarcely pass for independent evidence.

"Who invented letters?" is one of the questions in the Anglo-Saxon dialogue of Solomon and Saturn: the answer being—"Mercury the giant; that is Woden the God."

A metrical homily (all this is from Mr. Kemble) says:—

Sum man was gehâten	A man there was, called
Mercurius on life,	Mercury during life,
se was swiðe fâcenful	who was very fraudulent
and swícol on dædum,	and deceitful in deeds,
and lufode eâc stala	and eke loved thefts
and leâs brednysse;	and deception:
ðone macodon ða hæðenan	him the heathen made
him tó mǽran gode,	a powerful god for themselves,
and æt wega gelætum	and by the road-sides
him lâc affrodon,	made him offerings,
and tó heâgum beorgum	and upon high hills
him bróhton onsæghnysse.	brought him sacrifice.
Đæs god wæs árwurða	This god was honourable
betwux eallum hæðenum,	among all the heathen,
and he is Oþon gehâten,	and he is called Odin,
óðrum naman on Denisc.	by another name in Danish.
Đone feorðan dæg	The fourth day
hí sealdon him tó frófre	they gave for their advantage
ðâm foresædan Mercurie	to the aforesaid Mercury
heora mǽran gode.	their great god.

Other points of resemblance may—and have been—added between Woden and Mercury. Were these in existence when Tacitus wrote? If in existence, did they determine his identification? This is difficult to say. All that can safely be stated is, that, if Woden were not his analogue of Mercury, no known deity was. That this is not absolutely conclusive is admitted by Mr. Kemble, who writes: "Why

the interpretatio Romana fixed upon Woden as the corresponding god to Mercury, we do not clearly see; but we are not acquainted with the rites and legends which may have made this perfectly clear to the Romans."—Saxons in England, vol. i. 338. Other facts deepen the shade of this difficulty. Adam of Bremen, in his description of the temple at Upsala, writes: "Wodanem vero sculpunt armatum, sicuti nostri *Martem* sculpere solent."

Nevertheless, if some known god must be the analogue of Tacitus's Mercury, and if—besides this—it must be his *attributes* that determine the correspondence, Woden's claim—as aforesaid—is the best.

But another series of facts make it possible that the correspondence was determined less by the *attributes* than the *name*.

In more than one of the Gothic languages we have a dialogue in which one of the interlocutors is *Solomon*. Solomon exhibits his wisdom in a series of answers put to him by a gibing ironist—who, in the Anglo-Saxon dialogue, is called *Saturnus*, but in several of the French ones *Marcou*, the fuller and older form of which is *Marcolf*. Mr. Kemble, in his edition of the Anglo-Saxon work for the Ælfric Society, has given elaborate reasons for believing that the *Marcolf* is *Saturnus*, and *vice versâ*. The sort of fiction is a common one. Shrewd common-sense on one side, viewing all things in a practical light, and tincturing all things with a caustic irony, is brought into collision with the higher wisdom of a true sage; and, upon the ground of a fool being able to ask more questions in an hour than a wise man can answer in a day, succeeds in puzzling the higher wisdom of his opponent.

Now *Marcolf* is a German name; and although the *Marcolf* of the dialogue *may* have grown out of the *Mercurius* of the Classics, after being introduced on German ground, he *may* also have had an independent origin, and have been German from the beginning.

If so, this origin may have been as old as the time of Tacitus, so that that writer's analogue of his own Mercury may have been what, subsequently, became *Marcolf* or *Marcou*—the *name* being like, and the attributes not unlike.

Again—there is another view which may be taken.

The reasoning which has applied to the German analogue of *Mars* may, possibly, apply here also. There may have been a *name* similar to the Greek *Ermes*; in which case the process of a Classical writer would be, first to identify the deity with a *Greek* god, and then to give the result in a Latin *denomination*.

At any rate, the root *-rm*—(similar to that of the Greek Ἑρμῆς) occurs in the following notices—" Hæc eadem *Eres*-burg est corrupto vocabulo dicta, quam et Julius Cæsar Romano Imperio subegit, quando et *Arispolis* nomen habet ab eo qui *Aris* Græca designatione et Mars ipse dictus est Latino sermone. Duobus quidem idolis hæc dedita fuit, id est *Aris*, qui urbis mœnibus insertus, quasi dominator dominantium, et *Ermis* qui et Mercurius mercimoniis insistentibus colebatur in forensibus."—Annales Corvienses, ad ann. 1145.

But it is in the famous word *Irmin-sûl* that this root appears with the greatest prominence. *Sul=columna ;* so that *Irmin-sùl* is a compound word ; just like *Roland-seul, Thors-seul,* and *Æthelstan-súl.*

The Old High-German glosses explain it by *pyramis*, or similar words ; *e.g., irmin-sûlî=pyramides ; irman-sûl=colossus, altissima columna.*

Uf einir *yrmensûle*
Stuont ein Abgott ungeheure
Den hiezen sie ir *Koufman.*

or,

On an *Irminsûl*
Stood a monstrous idol
Which they call (*hight*) *merchant* (*chapman*).

When Charlemagne conquered the Old (Cheruscan) Saxons of Westphalia, the demolition of these heathen *Irminsûls* was one of his chief objects. His operations are thus described by the contemporary historians—" Domnus rex Karolus perrexit in Saxoniam et conquisivit Erisburgo et pervenit ad locum qui dicitur *Erminsûl* et succendit ea loca."—Annal. Petavienses.—" Fuit rex Carlus hostiliter in Saxoniâ et destruxit fanum eorum quod vocatur *Irminsul.*"—Annales Laurisham.

Quotations of this kind can be multiplied. They may all be found in the D. M., pp. 105, 106.

A measure of the vitality of the remnants of the *Irmin*-cult we find in the following verses still current amongst the common people of Westphalia :—

" *Hermen*, sla dermen
Sla pipen, sla trummen,
De Kaiser wil kummen
Met hamer und stangen
Wil *Hermin* uphangen."

or,

" *Hermen*, strike ——
Strike pipes, strike drums.
The Kaiser will come
With hammer and tongs
Will *Hermin* up-hang,"

referring to the demolition of the *Irminsûl* by Charlemagne (*Kaiser*).

The *Irmin* here meant may be the hero *Arminius* deified. His attributes, however (truly *Mercurial*), complicate this view : and the fact of an *Irmin-cultus* in Westphalia is, to a certain extent (I do not say how far), a ground for believing that the *name Irm-* may have suggested to Tacitus (or rather to Cæsar, who first mentions the German Mercury) the parallel of the text.

Of the previous views I cannot definitely say which is the least unsatisfactory.

[2] *Humanis—hostiis.*]—The extent to which this was the custom may be measured by the following extracts, chiefly taken from the D. M.—" Lucis propinquis barbaræ aræ, apud quas tribunos et primorum ordinum centuriones mactaverunt."—Tac. Ann. i. 61. " Sed bellum Hermunduris prosperum, Chattis exitiosius fuit, quia victores diversam aciem Marti ac Mercurio sacravere, quo voto, equi, viri, cuncta victa occidioni dantur."—Ann. xiii. 57. "Quorum unus Radagaisus. . . . Italiam belli feritate aggreditur, promittens sanguinem Christianorum deis suis litare, si vinceret."—Isidor. Chron. Goth. A.D. 446. " Quem Martem Gothi semper asperrima placavere cultura ; nam victimæ ejus mortes fuere capitorum, opinantes bellorum præsulem aptius humani sanguinis effusione placandum."—Jornandes, c. 5. " Mos est remeaturis decimum quemque captorum per æquales et cruciarias pœnas, plus ob hoc tristi quod superstitioso ritu necare."—Sidon. Apollin. viii. 6. " Si quis hominem diabolo sacrificaverit, et in hostiam, more paganorum, dæmonibus obtulerit, &c." —Capitul. de pag. Saxon. 9. " Hoc quoque inter alia crimina agi in partibus illis dixisti, quod quidam ex fidelibus ad immolandum paganis suis venundent mancipia."—Epistolæ Bonifacii, 25.

That the *Kelts* did the same is well known.

So did the *Lithuanians*.—" Dracones adorant cum volucribus, quibus etiam vivos litant homines, quos a mercatoribus emunt, diligenter omnino probatos, ne maculam in corpore habeant."—Adam of Bremen, De Situ Daniæ, c. 24. Here we find the import-

ance of the offering being without blemish as definitely recognized as in the Levitical Law.

So did the *Huns* and others.—"At Scythiani properant et quantoscunque prius in ingressu Scytharum habuere *litavere* victoriæ."—Jorn. 25. "Apud Cypri Salamínem humanam hostiam Jovi Teucrus immolavit; idque sacrificium posteris tradidit, quod est nuper, Hadriano imperante, sublatum. Erat apud Tauros, inhumanam ac feram gentem, ut Dianæ hospites immolarent, et id sacrificium multis temporibus celebratum est. Galli Esum et Teutatem humano cruore litabant. Ne Latini quidem hujus immanitatis expertes fuerunt. Siquidem Latialis Jupiter etiam nunc sanguine colitur humano."—Lactant. De Fals. Relig. lib. i. c. 21.

[3] *Herculem.*]—No known German deity has a name sufficiently like *Hercules* to suggest the reasoning that was suggested by the name *Marcolf* in a preceding note, reasoning which will reappear in the note that comes next. Hence, it must have been the *attributes* only which determined the identification.

Continuing the assumption that the analogue of Tacitus's Hercules is to be found in the later mythology, it may safely be said that—attribute for attribute—Thor is, at least, as like the son of Alcmena as Woden was to Mercury. The hammer of Thor might well have suggested the club of Hercules.

Add to this the extent and universality of the belief in Thor: both of which imply antiquity.

[4] *Martem.*]—In a well-known Anglo-Saxon poem in the Runic characters we find the following lines:—

Ear bið égle
Eorla gehwylcum,
ðonne fæstlíce
Flæsc onginneð
Hrá cólian,
Hrúsan ceósan
Blác tó gebeddan.
Blæda gedreósað,
Wynna gewítað,
Wera geswícað.

"Ear is a terror to every man, when fast the flesh, the corpse beginneth to become cold and pale, to seek the earth for a consort. Joy faileth, pleasure departeth, engagements cease."

Mr. Kemble, to whom I owe the whole of the contents of this note, truly remarks that if *ear=spica, arista, an ear of corn*, we get but an indifferent sense. On the contrary, if *ear* mean *the God of War*, the force of the passage is manifest. But can *ear* mean this? The following facts speak in the affirmative.

Tue-s-day=dies Martis; a fact which, as far as it goes, makes Tiw the analogue of the Roman *Mars*.

In some parts of South Germany, however, the third day of the week is not called Zistag (Tuesday) but *Er-tag, Eri-tag, Erich-tag* instead. Whence *Er=Tiw=Mars*.

In Saxon Westphalia, an undeniably heathen spot, now called *Mersberg, Mons Martis*, was originally called *Eres-burg.*—Saxons in England, vol. i. 253.

Such is the light thrown upon the text of Tacitus by subsequent records; faint but cheering; cheering but not satisfactory.

Ear is so like the Greek Ἄρης, that when Tacitus tells us that the Germans worshipped *Mars*, we may reasonably suppose that the *name* rather than the *attributes* led him to the identification. But then, why write *Mars* instead of *Ares?*

On the other hand, if he looked to the *attributes* rather than the *name, Tiw*, the undoubted analogue of *Mars*, in the word *Tue-s-day* (*=dies Martis*), would be his divinity.

The exact truth is beyond our reach: indeed, it is very likely that his *Mars* was neither one nor the other. Nevertheless, if the choice has to be made between *Tiw* and *Er*, it is the latter which commands the preference. *Tiw* has the *attributes* of Mars only: *Er* has both the attributes and an approach to his (Greek) *name* as well.

[s] *Pars Suevorum—Isidi sacrificat.*]—I believe that the goddess here noticed was identified with the Ægyptian on the strength of her *name* only.

A goddess named *Ziza*, was worshipped by the inhabitants of the parts about Augsburg; and either by means of tradition, history, or fragments of her *cultus*, her name was known to Küchlin, an Augsburg poet of the fourteenth century, A.D. 1373—1391.

> "Sie bawten einen tempel gross darein
> Zu eren *Zise* der abgöttin,
> Die sie nach haidnischer sitten
> Anbetten zu denselben zeiten.

Die stat ward genennt auch *Zisaris*,*
Nach der abgöttin, das was der pris.
Der tempel als lang stuond unversert
Bis im von alter was der val beschert.
Und da er von alter abgieng
Der berg namen von im empfieng;
Daruf gestanden was das werck,
Und haist noch hüt der *Zisenberck*."

"They built a great temple therein,
To the honour of *Zise* the heathen goddess
Whom they after heathen customs
Worshipped at that time;
The city was named eke *Zisaris*
After the heathen goddess, that was its glory.
The temple long stood entire
Until its fall was caused by age.
And when it from age went-off
The hill took the name from it;
Whereon the work stood,
And still hight *Zisenberg*."

Confirmatory of this is an extract from the Augsburg Chronicle, and, of equal value, is a fragment preserved in two MSS., one from Munich, and one from the monastery of St. Emmeram, wherein we find a passage, accompanied by marginal notes, headed "Excerpta ex Gallica Historia."

These are too lengthy for quotation; besides which, they are to be found in full in the D. M. pp. 260—272.

They agree, however, in containing, amongst much inaccurate and distorted history, the special statement that the parts in question were the head-quarters of the *cultus* of the *Dea Cisa*, "Quam religiosissime colebant, cujus templum quoque ex lignis barbarico ritu constructum, postquam eo colonia Romana deducta est, inviolatum permansit, ac vetustate collapsum nomen colli servavit. Quinquagesimo nono die, qua eo ventum est, cum is dies *Deæ Cizæ*, apud barbaros celeberrimus, ludum ac lasciviam magis quam formidinem ostentaret," &c.

* Qu. *Zizæ aræ*.—Grimm.

One of the marginal notes is the following couplet.—

> " Quem modo polluerat cultura nefaria dudum
> Gallus monticulum hunc tibi *Ciza* tulit,"

which, in the Augsburg Chronicle, appears in the body of the extract.

It may, then, be safely said that, in the thirteenth century, the memory of a local goddess, named *Zisa*, was preserved in the neighbourhood of Augsburg; and, although the parts about that city were, strictly speaking, *Vindelician* rather than *Suevic*, it may fairly be supposed that the *cultus* extended into the true *Suevic* area.

The following fact diminishes the difficulties involved in the difference of form between *Isis* and *Ziza*.

a. Meisterlin, who wrote about A.D. 1456, has the form with the final *-s*, " *Cizais*—der göttinn *Cisa*, die auch genent wird *Cizais*." This accounts for the final *-s*.

b. The form *Eysen* occurs. Grimm quotes the expression, " der amazonischen Augspurger japetisch fraw *Eysen*."

At the same time, it should be remembered that the writers who speak of *Frau Eysen*, may have been disposed to the adoption of that form from the name *Isis* in Tacitus. Hence the evidence in favour of the omission of the initial *C* or *Z*, is not unexceptionable.

That the present text influenced the views of the later writers concerning the Augsburg goddess, is certain; such a phenomenon being by no means unusual; since numerous instances could be adduced to show that an inaccurate account of a superstition in an influential writer, has acted upon the superstition itself—just as certain prophecies fulfil their own accomplishment.

At any rate, in the sixteenth century, we find *Frau Isis* with certain attributes, which may fairly be considered as foreign, and superadded to those of *Ciza*. Some of these are deducible from the notice of Tacitus; others referable to other sources of confusion. Thus, Jean le Maire, writing A.D. 1512, says, " Au temps duquel la deesse *Isis*, royne d'Ægypte, vient en Allemaigne et montra au rude peuple l'usaige de mouldre la farine et faire du pain."

Aventin (about A.D. 1522) says that it was from *Fraw Eysen*, that *iron* (German *eisen*) took its name, adding an account of her *cultus*, wherein mention is made of the *ship*, and *Hercules* is said to have been her father.—See D. M. i. 244.

Instead, then, of doubtfully suggesting the identity of *Ciza* and *Isis*, name for name, as is done by Grimm, I have no hesitation in assenting to it.

Whether traces of the characteristic *navigium* can be found in an equally satisfactory form, is another question. A long quotation from Rodolf's Chronicle of the Abbey of St. Trudo, is to be found in D. M. i. pp. 237—241. It tells us that, A.D. 1133, the country-people of the neighbourhood made a ship, put it on wheels, rolled it about from town to town, and attended it with song and dance from Tongres to Louvain.

This was done to annoy the weavers. It also annoyed the clergy. So much so, that such expressions as *navim infausto omine compactam—gentilitatis studium—profanas simulacri excubias—hortabantur ut comburatur—maligni spiritus qui in illa ferebantur—infausti ominis monstrum*, &c., occur in the account.

I agree with Grimm in thinking this particular procession, although mentioned as a single instance, to have been but the last of many previous ones—in other words, a *revival* of an old custom.

I also believe its origin to have been pagan.

But I am not satisfied that it has anything to do with either *Isis* or *Ziza*.

a. The locality of the *procession* was the parts about the Lower Rhine and Moselle, that of *Ziza*, Bavaria, and that of even the *Isis* of Tacitus the country of only *pars* Suevorum; so that whilst the deity is pre-eminently local, the custom is spread over a vast area.

b. Processions of the kind in question are common, without being connected with one another. The celebration of the breaking-up of the ice, and the beginning of the season for navigation might easily be celebrated on the Danube and on the Rhine with a similar ceremonial, without the necessity of supposing the one to have borrowed the custom from the other.

Something of this kind I imagine to have been the case with the supposed analogue of the *navigium Isidis* in Germany, boats being wheeled about at the beginning of the sailing season, just as on the 9th of January, or *Plough*-Monday, the labouring men of some parts of England go about as *Plough*-boys, or *Plough*-bullocks.

That either the *Isis* of Tacitus, or the *Ziza* * of the Augsburgers

* Supposing them (as I do not) to be different deities.

should be other than German, is considered utterly improbable by the great writer from whom I have taken all the quotations and references of the present note.

That she was *Slavonic* is the opinion of the present inquirer. But the most important fact connected with her *cultus*, is that of its being, at one and the same time—

a. *Suevic*, as we learn from the text of Tacitus; and—

b. *Vindilician*, as we infer from her temple at Augsburg.

6 *Cohibere parietibus deos.*]—This absence of *temples* is partly borne out by what we find in later writers, partly subjected to modification.

A. It is partly borne out by the fact of no German tongue containing a *simple* term equivalent to the Latin *templum* (*delubrum*, *ædes*), of which both the *signification* and the *native origin* are beyond doubt.

1. In Ulfilas, ἱερόν (Joh. xviii. 20) is translated by *Gud-hus*= *God's house*. This word, however, occurs but once, and is a compound.

2. The usual word=ναός is *alhs*.

The reasons for believing this word to be native (the view supported by the authority of Grimm) are as follows:—

a. The genitive case is *alhs*, and the dative *alh*, instead of *alhais* and *alhai*; irregularity (so-called) being *primâ facie* evidence of the word in which it occurs being native.

b. In Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon, the word is of the masculine gender.

c. It *may* be the word *Alces* of § 43.

d. It occurs as an element of several compound proper names, both of men and places—*Ala*-holf, *Ala*-dorp, &c.

Against it lie

a. Its likeness to the Latin word *aula*.

b. Its being, in Mœso-Gothic, of the feminine gender.

c. Its absence in all the *Norse* languages.

d. Its power of *palace* or *royal dwelling*, a meaning quite as usual as that of *holy edifice*.

It is safe then to say that the native origin of *alh*=*templum* is not beyond doubt.

3. *V-g* is the third root with a meaning allied to that of *templum*, enumerated in the chapter of the D. M. referred to.

Its chief forms are *wih, weoh, wig,* and *ve.* It is truly Gothic in origin, but, in meaning, fluctuates between *grove, idol,* and *holy building,* the latter power being the most uncertain.

4. *H-r-k* is in the same predicament. Its chief forms are *haruc, hara, hearg, hörg,* and, although it sometimes=*templum,* its primary meaning is *lucus,* or rather (perhaps) the Greek *τέμενος.*

B. The chief text which modifies the belief in the utter absence of *temples* amongst the Germans is Adam of Bremen's notice of the temple at *Sigtuna*—"Nobilissimum illa gens *templum* habet, quod Upsula vocatur, non longe positum a Sigtuna civitate vel Birka. In hoc templo, quod totum ex auro paratum est, statuas trium deorum veneratur populus, ita ut potentissimus eorum Thor in medio solium habeat triclinio. Hinc et inde locum possident Wodan et Fricco." —De Sit. Dan. c. 233.

On the other hand, the sacro-sanctitude of trees and groves is beyond doubt. It was truly German. At the same time it must be remembered that it was *Slavonic* as well.

X. Auspicia, sortesque,[1] ut qui maximè, observant. Sortium consuetudo simplex: virgam, frugiferæ arbori decisam, in surculos amputant, eosque, notis quibusdam discretos, super candidam vestem temerè ac fortuitò spargunt: mox, si publicè consuletur, sacerdos civitatis, sin privatim, ipse paterfamiliæ, precatus deos, cœlumque suspiciens, ter singulos tollit, sublatos, secundùm impressam antè notam, interpretatur. Si prohibuerunt, nulla, de eâdem re, in eumdem diem, consultatio: sin permissum, auspiciorum adhuc fides exigitur. Et illud quidem etiam hìc notum, avium voces, volatusque interrogare. Proprium gentis, equorum quoque præsagia ac monitus experiri: publicè aluntur iisdem nemoribus ac lucis, candidi, et nullo mortali opere contacti, quos pressos sacro curru sacerdos, ac rex, vel princeps civitatis, comitantur, hinnitusque ac fremitus observant. Nec ulli auspicio major fides, non solùm

apud plebem, sed apud proceres, apud sacerdotes. Se enim ministros deorum, illos conscios putant. Est et alia observatio auspiciorum, quâ gravium bellorum eventus explorant. Ejus gentis, cum quâ bellum est, captivum quoquo modo interceptum, cum electo popularium suorum, patriis quemque armis committunt: victoria hujus, vel illius, pro præjudicio accipitur.

NOTE ON SECTION X.

[1] *Auspicia sortesque, &c.*]—The use "of lots as connected with heathendom, that is, as a means of looking into futurity, continued in vogue among the Saxons till a late period, in spite of the efforts of the clergy. This is evident from the many allusions in the Pœnitentials, and the prohibitions of the secular law. The augury by horses does not appear to have been used in England, from any allusion at least which still survives; but it was still current in Germany in the seventh century, and with less change of adjuncts than we usually find in the adoption of heathen forms by Christian saints. It was left to the decision of horses to determine where the mortal remains of St. Gall should rest. The saint would not move till certain unbroken horses were brought and charged with his coffin; then, after prayers, we are told, 'Elevato igitur a pontifice necnon a sacerdote feretro et equis superposito, ait episcopus. "Tollite frena de capitibus eorum, et pergant ubi Dominus voluerit." Vexillum ergo crucis cum luminaribus adsumebatur, et psallentes, equis præcedentibus, via incipiebatur.'"—Anon. Vita Sanct. Gall., Pertz Monum. ii. 17.—From The Saxons in England, vol. i. p. 429.

XI. De minoribus rebus principes[1] consultant, de majoribus omnes: ita tamen, ut ea quoque, quorum penes plebem[2] arbitrium est, apud principes pertractentur. Coeunt, nisi quid fortuitum et subitum inciderit, certis diebus, cùm aut inchoatur luna, aut impletur: nam agendis rebus hoc auspicatissimum initium

credunt. Nec dierum numerum, ut nos, sed noctium[3] computant. Sic constituunt, sic condicunt: nox ducere diem videtur. Illud ex libertate vitium, quòd non simul, nec ut jussi conveniunt, sed et alter, et tertius dies cunctatione coeuntium absumitur. Ut turbæ placuit, considunt armati. Silentium per sacerdotes, quibus tum et coercendi jus est, imperatur. Mox rex, vel princeps, prout ætas cuique, prout nobilitas, prout decus bellorum, prout facundia est, audiuntur, auctoritate suadendi magis, quàm jubendi potestate. Si displicuit sententia, fremitu aspernantur: sin placuit, frameas concutiunt. Honoratissimum assensûs genus est, armis laudare.

NOTES ON SECTION XI.

[1] *Principes.*]—The office of the *princeps* was *elective* (the election taking place at the *folc-mót*), and probably *annual*, or for a limited period only. His duties were *judicial*, and the authority extended over *ten tithings=one hundred*. This sufficiently distinguishes him from the *dux*. The most probable German word thus rendered was *ealdor-man*.

In the historical period the court of the ealdorman of the hundred was held once a month. Arbitration, and the consideration of the extent to which the peace had been kept or broken, was the business here—*i.e.*, the prevention rather than the punishment of wrong.

The higher matters belonged to the *concilium* (*folc-mót*).

[2] *Plebem.*]—This, a term far less definite than it was in the eyes of a Roman, means all who were, at one and the same time, *above* the rank of *servus* or *libertus* (*ge-bûr*, *læt-a* or *þeov*), *below* the rank of *ingenuus* (*æþele*), and resident on the land.

Such are the probable limits; because it is not likely that it applied to the *ge-siþas*, or personal retainers of the chief, nor yet to the *duces*, or the order (*æþelas*) out of which they were chosen.

[3] *Noctium.*]—Of the length of the minor divisions of the month,

in the time of Tacitus, we know nothing: neither can we speculate as to the nature of the events on which they were based.

That the periods, however, found in the text before us (like the present word *seven-night, se'n-night*) which we suppose to have been designated by some compound of the word *-night*, were shorter than those of the *months*, is nearly certain.

Month is so truly a word of German origin, and so definitely connected with *moon*, that we may safely believe that the natural period of twenty-eight days was always recognised, and always called, as at present. In other words, it is unlikely that the name for *month* should have been the compound, or combination, of the root *n-gt* in question.

Still less is it likely that the compound in question was applied to a longer period than that of the month.

That the month then was divided into smaller periods is the fair inference from the present passage,—and that the quarters of the moon were the phenomena which determined their length, is also likely.

Still the German equivalent to the Roman *nundinæ*, and the Christian *week*, is a point which has still to be investigated.

That such prominence should be given to the reckoning by *nights*, if it merely meant that where a Roman said so many *days* a German said so many *nights*, is unlikely. There was, surely, some period of time designated by the root *night* + either a *numeral* or some similar compositional element.

XII. Licet apud concilium[1] accusare[2] quoque, et discrimen capitis intendere. Distinctio pœnarum[3] ex delicto: proditores et transfugas arboribus suspendunt: ignavos, et imbelles, et corpore infames, cœno ac palude, injectâ insuper crate, mergunt. Diversitas supplicii illuc respicit, tamquam scelera ostendi oporteat, dum puniuntur, flagitia abscondi. Sed et levioribus delictis, pro modo, pœna: equorum pecorumque numero convicti multantur: pars multæ[4] regi, vel civitati, pars ipsi qui vindicatur, vel propinquis ejus exsol-

vitur. Eliguntur in iisdem conciliis et principes, qui jura per pagos vicosque reddunt. Centeni singulis ex plebe comites,[5] consilium simul et auctoritas, adsunt.

NOTES ON SECTION XII.

[1] *Concilium.*]—The probable name of this was in the Saxon districts, at least some compound of *môt*=*meeting*, e.g., *ge-môt*, or *folc-môt.*

Further north it may have been *Đing*=*concilium.* In Scandinavia the word is existing at the present moment in the name of the Norwegian parliament, or *Stor-ting*=great *council.*

[2] *Licet apud concilium accusare.*]—The *concilium* here is the *folcmôt,* the question being one not of prevention, or arbitration, but of punishment. As such it lay beyond the jurisdiction of the smaller court of the *hundred.*

In many cases this *accusatio* was likely to have been made by the *princeps* and his *comites,* in their capacity of representatives of the hundred: indeed, unless we suppose this to have been the case, the *fæhðe,* or right of private revenge, would leave but little in the way of criminal jurisdiction to the *concilium* (folcmote).

[3] *Pœnarum.*]—The absence of any punishments severer than *fines* for even homicide in the Anglo-Saxon laws has engendered the belief that the German laws were mild.

The horrible cruelty of many of their punishments may be seen in Grimm's Deutsche Rechts Alterthümer.

[4] *Pars multæ.*]—Of the two parts into which the penalty fell, that which accrued to the state was the *wîte,* that which accrued to the individual the *wehre.* When, over and above the private *feud,* the state interfered, it is likely that the *wîte* became increased. In this case the term *frið*=*peace* and *ban*=*ban,* or *proclamation,* came into use.

[5] *Centeni—comites.*]—The organization here is exactly the opposite of that which gives us the *mæg-burh* (*familiæ et propinquitates*).

Instead of the *indefinitude* involved in the word *kin,* the *number* here is fixed=100.

Neighbourhood, too, and locality stand in place of blood and descent as the bond.

Of these two elements that of *number* was the first to become obsolete, so that tithings came to contain more or less than 100, as the case might be. The second, that of neighbourhood and locality, exists at the present time.

In the *country*, it would be the *area* which would have the greater tendency to remain fixed and permanent as the characteristic element of the tithing and hundred; in *towns* it would be the *number* of individuals.

Hence, in the tenth century we find the following account of the *municipal* equivalent to the hundred:—"This is the ordinance which the bishops and the reeves belonging to London have obtained, and confirmed with pledges, among our *friðgylds*, as well *eorlish* as *ceorlish*, in addition to the doomes which were fixed at Greatley, at Exeter, and at Thundersfield.

"Resolved: that we count every ten men together, and the chief one to direct the nine in each of those duties which we have all ordained, and afterwards the hyndens of them together, and one hynden man who shall admonish the ten for our common benefit; and let these eleven hold the money of the hynden, and decide that they shall disburse, when aught is to pay, and what they shall receive, should money accrue to us at our common suit. . . .

"That we gather to us once in every month, if we can, and have leisure, the hynden-men, and those who direct the tithings, as well with butt-filling, or as else may please us, and know what of our agreement has been executed. And let these twelve men have their refection together, and feed themselves as they themselves think right, and deal the remains of the meal for love of God."

Upon this, the writer from whom the notice is taken, continues: "As this valuable record mentions also territorial tithings, containing different amounts of population, it seems to me to furnish important confirmation of the conclusion that the *gegyldan* of Ini and Ælfred, the members of the London tithings or friðgylds of ten, and the York *tenmantale*, are in truth identical. And it is further in favour of this view that the citizens called the members of such *gildships*, *gegyldan*:—

"And we have also ordained, respecting every man who has given his pledge in our gyldships, that should he die, each gyld-brother (gegylda) shall give a gesufel-loaf for his soul, and sing a fifty (psalms), or cause the same to be sung within xxx days."—Judicia Civitatis Londinensis, from Kemble's Saxons in England, vol. i.

The following extract illustrates this still further: — "And another peace, the greatest of all, there is, whereby all are maintained in firmer state, to wit, in the establishment of a guarantee, which the English call *a Friðborgas,* with the exception of the men of York, who call it *Tenmannetale,* that is, the number of ten men. And it consists in this, that in all the vills throughout the kingdom, all men are bound to be in a guarantee by tens, so that if one of the ten men offend, the other nine may hold him to right. But if he should flee, and they allege that they could not have him to right, then should be given them, by the king's justice, a space of at least thirty days and one; and if they could find him they might bring him to justice. But for himself, let him out of his own restore the damage he has done, or, if the offence be so grave, let justice be done upon his body. But if within the aforesaid term he could not be found, since in every friðborh there was one headman should take two of the best men of his friðborh, and the headman of each of the three friðborgs most nearly neighbouring to his own, and likewise two of the best in each, if he can have them; and so with the eleven others he shall, if he can, clear both himself and his friðborh, both of the offence and flight of the aforesaid malefactor. Which, if he cannot do, he shall restore the damage done out of the property of the doer, so long as this shall last, and out of his own, and that of his *friðborh;* and they shall make amends to the justice according as it shall be by law adjudged them. And, moreover, the oath which they could not complete with the *venue,* the nine themselves shall make, *viz.,* they that had no part in the offence. And if at any time they can recover him, they shall bring him to the justice, if they can, or tell the justice where he is."—Ibid.

XIII. Nihil autem neque publicæ neque privatæ rei, nisi armati agunt. Sed arma sumere non antè cuiquam moris, quàm civitas suffecturum probaverit. Tum in ipso concilio, vel principum aliquis, vel pater, vel propinquus scuto frameâque juvenem ornant: hæc apud illos toga, hic primus juventæ honos: ante hoc

domûs pars videntur, mox reipublicæ. Insignis nobilitas, aut magna patrum merita, principis dignationem etiam adolescentulis adsignant. Ceteri robustioribus ac jampridem probatis aggregantur: nec rubor inter comites aspici. Gradus quinetiam et ipse comitatus habet, judicio ejus, quem sectantur: magnaque et comitum æmulatio, quibus primus apud principem suum locus; et principum, cui plurimi et acerrimi comites.[1] Hæc dignitas, hæ vires, magno semper electorum juvenum globo circumdari, in pace decus, in bello præsidium. Nec solùm in suâ gente cuique, sed apud finitimas quoque civitates id nomen, ea gloria est, si numero ac virtute comitatus emineat: expetuntur enim legationibus, et muneribus ornantur, et ipsâ plerumque famâ bella profligant.

NOTE ON SECTION XIII.

[1] *Comitatus—Comites.*]—The German of this translation was probably some older form of the Anglo-Saxon *gesið*, plural, *ge-si-ðas*= *retainers.*

XIV. Cum ventum in aciem, turpe principi virtute vinci; turpe comitatui, virtutem principis non adæquare. Jam verò infame in omnem vitam ac probrosum, superstitem principi suo ex acie recessisse. Illum defendere, tueri, sua quoque fortia facta gloriæ ejus adsignare, præcipuum sacramentum est. Principes pro victoriâ pugnant: comites pro principe. Si civitas[1] in quâ orti sunt, longâ pace et otio torpeat: plerique nobilium adolescentium petunt ultro eas nationes, quæ tum bellum aliquod gerunt; quia et ingrata genti

quies, et faciliùs inter ancipitia clarescunt, magnumque comitatum non nisi vi belloque tueare: exigunt enim principis sui liberalitate illum bellatorem equum, illam cruentam victricemque frameam. Nam epulæ, et quamquam incompti, largi tamen apparatus pro stipendio cedunt. Materia munificentiæ per bella et raptus. Nec arare terram, aut exspectare annum, tam facilè persuaseris, quàm vocare hostes et vulnera mereri: pigrum quinimmo et iners videtur sudore adquirere, quod possis sanguine parare.

NOTE ON SECTION XIV.

[1] *Civitas.*]—The likeliest name for the community thus designated, is *ge-land,* the occupants of the same *ge-land* being *ge-landan.*

Many *ge-lande* might make a *ric=kingdom.*

The most probable name for the smaller districts, such as *Fosi, Chas-uarii,* &c., was *ge-land:* the larger ones, like that of the Cherusci, being a *ric.*

There is no reason to believe that these *free companies* (for such they really were) limited their offers of service to members of the Germanic family only. The utmost in the way of restrictions in this respect, which we can suppose them to have laid upon themselves is, that they should not fight against members of the alliance to which they belonged, whilst on their own soil.

The bearing of this upon many questions is important, since it invalidates the notion that a German name for a chief is a sufficient reason for believing his followers to be Germans.

XV. Quotiens bella non ineunt, non multum venatibus;[1] plus per otium transigunt, dediti somno, ciboque. Fortissimus quisque ac bellicosissimus nihil agens, delegatâ domûs et penatium et agrorum curâ feminis senibusque, et infirmissimo cuique ex familiâ,

ipsi hebent: mirâ diversitate naturæ, cùm iidem homines sic ament inertiam, et oderint quietem. Mos est civitatibus ultro ac viritim conferre principibus vel armentorum vel frugum, quod pro honore acceptum, etiam necessitatibus subvenit. Gaudent præcipuè finitimarum gentium donis, quæ non modò a singulis, sed publicè mittuntur: electi equi, magna arma, phaleræ, torquesque. Jam et pecuniam accipere docuimus.

NOTE ON SECTION XV.

[1] *Venatibus.*]—This is a measure of the extent to which the Germans were exclusively agricultural—at least agricultural as opposed to populations in the hunter-state.

Probably, *except in the Marks*, there was less game in Germany in the time of Tacitus than there is now.

XVI. Nullas Germanorum populis urbes[1] habitari, satis notum est, ne pati quidem inter se junctas sedes. Colunt discreti ac diversi, ut fons, ut campus, ut nemus placuit. Vicos locant, non in nostrum morem, connexis et cohærentibus ædificiis: suam quisque domum spatio circumdat, sive adversùs casus ignis remedium, sive inscitiâ ædificandi. Ne cæmentorum quidem apud illos aut tegularum usus; materiâ ad omnia utuntur informi, et citra speciem aut delectationem. Quædam loca diligentiùs illinunt terrâ ita purâ ac splendente, ut picturam ac lineamenta colorum imitetur. Solent et subterraneos specus aperire, eosque multo insuper fimo onerant, suffugium hiemi et receptaculum frugibus: quia rigorem frigorum ejusmodi locis molliunt: et si quando hostis advenit, aperta populatur: abdita autem et defossa, aut ignorantur, aut eo ipso fallunt, quòd quærenda sunt.

NOTE ON SECTION XVI.

1 *Nullas—urbes.*]—Exceptions must be made to this statement, if we give much importance to the assertion that numerous nations on the Gallic side of the Rhine were Germans—*e.g.*, the *Nemetes, Vangiones, Triboci, Treviri*, &c. In all the districts belonging to these so-called Germans, there were considerable towns. Of course, these may have been Gallic, whilst the country was German.

As for the text itself, it must be looked upon as having reference to the well-known passage in Cæsar, rather than as a piece of separate and independent evidence.

The intercourse with the *Hermundorum civitas* (§ 41) by no means implies the existence of a town or city. A periodical fair on the Danube will give us all the phenomena implied by the passage in question.

XVII. Tegumen omnibus sagum, fibulâ, aut, si desit, spinâ consertum: cetera intecti, totos dies juxta focum atque ignem agunt. Locupletissimi veste distinguuntur, non fluitante, sicut Sarmatæ ac Parthi, sed strictâ et singulos artus exprimente. Gerunt et ferarum pelles,[1] proximi ripæ negligenter, ulteriores exquisitiùs, ut quibus nullus per commercia cultus. Eligunt feras, et detracta velamina spargunt maculis pellibusque belluarum, quas exterior Oceanus, atque ignotum mare gignit. Nec alius feminis quàm viris habitus, nisi quòd feminæ sæpius lineis amictibus velantur, eosque purpurâ variant, partemque vestitûs superioris in manicas non extendunt, nudæ brachia ac lacertos: sed et proxima pars pectoris patet.

NOTE ON SECTION XVII.

1 *Ferarum pelles.*]—Whether the word *leather* be of Germanic or Keltic origin is uncertain.

The oldest exhumations have presented a body wrapped in skin, in a rude, coffin-shaped, rough-hewed tree. The dress, as described in the present passage, consists of *hides;* both as leather and furs. For the latter, Scandinavia was famous in the seventh century. "Alia vero gens ibi moratur Suethans, quæ velut Thuringi, equis utuntur eximiis. Hi quoque sunt, qui in usus Romanorum Saphirinas pelles commercio interveniente per alias innumeras gentes transmittunt, famosi pellium decora nigredine. Hi quum inopes vivunt, ditissime vestiuntur."—Jornand. De Reb. Get. c. 3.

The long flowing dresses of the Sarmatians were chiefly made by the process of *felting*, those of the Parthians, by that of *weaving;* *wool* being the chief material of the former, *wool*, *cotton*, and even *silk* of the latter.

XVIII. Quamquam severa illic matrimonia:[1] nec ullam morum partem magis laudaveris: nam propè soli barbarorum singulis uxoribus contenti sunt: exceptis admodum paucis, qui non libidine, sed ob nobilitatem plurimis nuptiis ambiuntur. Dotem non uxor marito, sed uxori maritus offert. Intersunt parentes et propinqui, ac munera probant: munera non ad delicias muliebres quæsita, nec quibus nova nupta comatur; sed boves et frenatum equum, et scutum cum frameâ gladioque. In hæc munera uxor accipitur: atque invicem ipsa armorum aliquid viro affert: hoc maximum vinculum, hæc arcana sacra, hos conjugales deos arbitrantur. Ne se mulier extra virtutum cogitationes, extraque bellorum casus putet, ipsis incipientis matrimonii auspiciis admonetur, venire se laborum periculorumque sociam, idem in pace, idem in prœlio passuram ausuramque; hoc juncti boves, hoc paratus equus, hoc data arma denuntiant. Sic vivendum, sic pereundum: accipere se quæ liberis inviolata ac

digna reddat, quæ nurus accipiant, rursusque ad nepotes referant.

NOTE ON SECTION XVIII.

[1] *Severa—matrimonia.*]—A measure of the consideration in which females were held, may be found in the Codex Diplomaticus.

A widow had the power of devising her land. A son having brought an action against his mother in the Anglo-Saxon County Court, was, upon the latter receiving notification thereof, disinherited by her on the spot, and that in the following words:—"Here sitteth Leôflæd my kinswoman, unto whom I grant both my *land* and my gold, and gown, and dress, and all that I own, after my day (death)." "Her sit Leôflæd mîn mæge, ðe ic ge-ann ægðer ge mînes landes, ge mînes goldes, ge hrægles, ge reâfes, ge ealles ðe ic âh, æfter mînon dæge."

Nay more, there was one sort of property, *at least*, which a married woman might bequeath even during the life-time of her husband. This was the *morning-gift* (*morgengifu*), presented to her by her husband, the morning after the consummation of her marriage. "In several wills, the husband carefully points out the lands to which his wife has this claim; and, in several cases, women appeal to it as their title to lands which they are desirous of alienating."—Kemble, Codex Diplomaticus, vol. 1, cix., cx.

XIX. Ergo septâ pudicitiâ agunt, nullis spectaculorum inlecebris, nullis conviviorum inritationibus corruptæ. Literarum secreta viri pariter ac feminæ ignorant.[1] Paucissima in tam numerosâ gente adulteria, quorum pœna præsens, et maritis permissa. Accisis crinibus, nudatam, coram propinquis, expellit domo maritus, ac per omnem vicum verbere agit: publicatæ enim pudicitiæ nulla venia: non formâ, non ætate, non opibus maritum invenerit. Nemo enim illic vitia ridet: nec corrumpere et corrumpi, sæculum vocatur. Meliùs quidem adhuc eæ civi-

tates, in quibus tantùm virgines nubunt, et cum spe votoque uxoris semel transigitur. Sic unum accipiunt maritum, quo modo unum corpus, unamque vitam, ne ulla cogitatio ultrà, ne longior cupiditas, ne tamquam maritum, sed tamquam matrimonium ament. Numerum liberorum finire, aut quemquam ex agnatis necare, flagitium habetur: plusque ibi boni mores valent, quàm alibi bonæ leges.

NOTE ON SECTION XIX.

[1] *Literarum secreta—ignorant.*]—The Mœso-Gothic alphabet of the Goths of the third century was formed upon the Greek.

The Anglo-Saxon alphabet, the next in point of antiquity, was Roman in origin.

It is only by exaggerating the antiquity of the inscriptions called *Runic*, that any exception can be taken to the literal interpretation of the passage. Yet the oldest Runic inscription is subsequent to the year A.D. 800.

Rûn=*sulcus*=*furrow;* and this interpretation well explains their nature. The *Runic* letters were fitted for being *cut* on wood or stone —not *written.* Consequently, they were available only for comparatively short inscriptions.

But *rûn*=*mysterium*=*secret* as well. I imagine this to be a power deduced from the earlier signification=*letter*, the earliest being *furrow.*

XX. In omni domo nudi ac sordidi, in hos artus, in hæc corpora, quæ miramur, excrescunt. Sua quemque mater uberibus alit, nec ancillis ac nutricibus delegantur. Dominum ac servum nullis educationis deliciis dignoscas. Inter eadem pecora, in eâdem humo degunt, donec ætas separet ingenuos, virtus agnoscat. Sera juvenum Venus;[1] eoque inexhausta pubertas:

nec virgines festinantur; eadem juventa, similis proceritas: pares validæque miscentur: ac robora parentum liberi referunt. Sororum filiis idem apud avunculum, qui apud patrem honor. Quidam sanctiorem arctioremque hunc nexum sanguinis arbitrantur, et in accipiendis obsidibus magis exigunt; tamquam ii, et animum firmiùs, et domum latiùs teneant. Heredes tamen successoresque sui cuique liberi: et nullum testamentum. Si liberi non sunt, proximus gradus in possessione fratres, patrui, avunculi. Quantò plus propinquorum, quò major adfinium numerus, tantò gratiosior senectus: nec ulla orbitatis pretia.

NOTE ON SECTION XX.

[1] *Sera juvenum Venus.*]—Whatever may have been the age of puberty, that of *infancy* (in the legal sense of the term) ended with the Anglo-Saxon at 12.

At that time the youth was *mundig*, *i.e.*, his own master, or at least responsible.

XXI. Suscipere tam inimicitias,[1] seu patris, seu propinqui, quàm amicitias necesse est: nec implacabiles durant. Luitur enim etiam homicidium certo armentorum ac pecorum numero, recipitque satisfactionem universa domus: utiliter in publicum; quia periculosiores sunt inimicitiæ juxta libertatem. Convictibus et hospitiis non alia gens effusiùs indulget. Quemcumque mortalium arcere tecto, nefas habetur: pro fortunâ quisque apparatis epulis excipit. Cùm defecere, qui modò hospes fuerat, monstrator hospitii et comes, proximam domum non invitati adeunt: nec interest: pari humanitate accipiuntur. Notum igno-

tumque, quantum ad jus hospitii, nemo discernit. Abeunti, si quid poposcerit, concedere moris: et poscendi invicem eadem facilitas. Gaudent muneribus: sed nec data imputant, nec acceptis obligantur.

NOTE ON SECTION XXI.

[1] *Suscipere—inimicitias.*]—The liability of private quarrels, and, perhaps, even the recognition of the right of private warfare involved in this custom, appears at the beginning of the legal period under some form of the root *f-ð*.

In the Frisian Laws (xi. 2), the form is *fæhðe=feud.*

Fæhðe itself is a derivation of *fá=foe.*—Saxons in England chap. x.

XXII. Victus inter hospites comis. Statim e somno, quem plerumque in diem extrahunt, lavantur,[1] sæpiùs calidâ, ut apud quos plurimùm hiems occupat. Lauti, cibum capiunt: separatæ singulis sedes, et sua cuique mensa. Tum ad negotia, nec minus sæpe ad convivia procedunt armati. Diem noctemque continuare potando, nulli probrum. Crebræ, ut inter vinolentos rixæ, raró conviciis, sæpiùs cæde et vulneribus transiguntur. Sed et de reconciliandis invicem inimicis, et jungendis adfinitatibus, et adsciscendis principibus, de pace denique ac bello plerumque in conviviis consultant: tamquam nullo magis tempore aut ad simplices cogitationes pateat animus, aut ad magnas incalescat. Gens non astuta, nec callida, aperit adhuc secreta pectoris, licentiâ joci. Ergo detecta et nuda omnium mens, posterâ die retractatur; et salva utriusque temporis ratio est. Deliberant, dum fingere nesciunt: constituunt, dum errare non possunt.

NOTE ON SECTION XXII.

¹ *Lavantur.*]—The use of the bath is recognised throughout the Old Norse Sagas.

XXIII. Potui humor ex hordeo aut frumento, in quamdam similitudinem vini corruptus.[1] Proximi ripæ et vinum mercantur. Cibi simplices: agrestia poma, recens fera, aut lac concretum. Sine apparatu, sine blandimentis expellunt famem. Adversùs sitim, non eadem temperantia. Si indulseris ebrietati, suggerendo quantum concupiscunt, haud minùs facilè vitiis, quàm armis vincentur.

NOTE ON SECTION XXIII.

¹ *Humor ex hordeo aut frumento—corruptus.*]—Both the words *ale* and *beer* are of Germanic origin. The Keltic term, on the other hand, is *cwrrw=cerevisia,* from the Latin.

XXIV. Genus spectaculorum unum, atque in omni cœtu idem. Nudi juvenes, quibus id ludicrum est, inter gladios se, atque infestas frameas, saltu jaciunt. Exercitatio artem paravit, ars decorem: non in quæstum tamen, aut mercedem: quamvis audacis lasciviæ pretium est, voluptas spectantium. Aleam (quod mirere) sobrii inter seria exercent, tantâ lucrandi perdendive temeritate, ut, cùm omnia defecerunt, extremo ac novissimo jactu de libertate et de corpore contendant. Victus voluntariam servitutem[1] adit: quamvis junior, quamvis robustior, alligari se ac venire

patitur. Ea est in re pravâ pervicacia: ipsi fidem vocant. Servos conditionis hujus per commercia tradunt, ut se quoque pudore victoriæ exsolvant.

NOTE ON SECTION XXIV.

[1] *Voluntariam servitutem.*]—This must have been servitude applied to offices attached to the *person* not to the *land*—at least if the suggestion of the next note be correct.

XXV. Ceteris servis, non, in nostrum morem, descriptis per familiam ministeriis, utuntur. Suam quisque sedem,[1] suos penates regit. Frumenti modum dominus, aut pecoris, aut vestis, ut colono, injungit: et servus hactenus paret. Cetera domûs officia uxor ac liberi exsequuntur. Verberare servum ac vinculis et opere coercere, rarum. Occidere solent, non disciplinâ et severitate, sed impetu et irâ, ut inimicum, nisi quòd impunè. Libertini[2] non multum supra servos sunt, raròaliquod momentum in domo, numquam in civitate, exceptis dumtaxat iis gentibus, quæ regnantur. Ibi enim et super ingenuos et super nobiles ascendunt: apud ceteros, impares libertini libertatis argumentum sunt.

NOTES ON SECTION XXV.

[1] *Suam quisque sedem.*]—*Quisque,* i.e., *servus.*—This was, in reality, an *adscriptio glebæ;* the slave belonging to the land, and, by a parity of reasoning, not sufficiently recognized by the generality of writers on the subject, the land (to a certain degree) belonged to the slave.

Unless we suppose the smallest free cultivator to have had slaves under him (as unlikely a doctrine as that the smallest freehold farmer in England has a regular set of labourers attached to his

land), the system of land cultivated for a landlord who took no part in the work, and the system of land cultivated by the holders themselves must have been in the inverse ratio to each other.

Probably, the land of the latter sort was commonest in the countries which had been independent from the first; the latter in those wherein conquests had occurred—the *servi*, in the sense of the present section, being the original owners.

At any rate, an inordinate proportion of land thus cultivated by *servi* for an idle, and probably non-resident class (of, perhaps, fighting men), is incompatible with the evolution of free institutions.

Slavery then, I think, was an exceptionable case in Germany.

The probable name for the *servus* of the section was *ge-bûr*=*bauer* =*peasant*.

[2] *Libertini.*]—It is true that *manumission* occurs in the earliest Anglo-Saxon charters.

But it is also true that the earliest of these are later than the introduction of Christianity.

I cannot, then, think that *libertus*=*manumitted slave.*

More probably, the *servus* of Tacitus, was a dependent attached to the land (*prædial*); the *libertus* one attached to the person (*personal*).

The name may have been *læt*, Pl. *læt-as* = *leute* in Modern German.

Of these—the *younger* individuals may have been *knav-as*, *knap-as*, *knecht-s* = *knaves* = *knights*; the humbler in point of occupation, *þeav-as*=*thieves.*

XXVI. Fenus agitare,[1] et in usuras extendere, ignotum: ideoque magis servatur quàm si vetitum esset. Agri, pro numero cultorum, ab universis per vices[2] occupantur, quos mox inter se secundùm dignationem partiuntur: facilitatem partiendi camporum spatia præstant. Arva per annos mutant; et superest ager: nec enim cum ubertate et amplitudine soli labore

contendunt, ut pomaria conserant, et prata separent, et hortos rigent: sola terræ seges imperatur. Unde annum quoque ipsum non in totidem digerunt species: hiems, et ver, et æstas intellectum ac vocabula habent: autumni perinde nomen ac bona ignorantur.

NOTES ON SECTION XXVI.

[1] *Fenus agitare.*]—The extent to which the author of *Germania* made its ethnology secondary to the *moral* effect of contrasting simple and hardy Germany with artificial and luxurious Rome may be measured by the passage. No mere geographer, or ethnologist, would devote a chapter to saying there was no usury, when he had previously said there was no money.

The last sentence of § 19, comes under the remark.

Each is a *negative* statement, which would not be made except a *contrast* were intended with some country where the customs were but too common.

[2] *Pro numero cultorum—per vices.*]—It is only by fresh divisions that land, once apportioned amongst a certain number of cultivators, can remain in any permanent relation to the number of those cultivators.

Again: it is only by an increase of either land, or the product of land, proportionate to the increase of population, that the respective competences of the cultivators can remain the same.

Hence the words *pro numero cultorum* create a difficulty, which is enhanced by the words *per vices.*

Mox.—This is the most difficult word of the section. *Per vices* implies change from one set of holders to another; and *mox—partiuntur* does more. It denotes a change from a system of periodical transfers to one of permanent appropriation.

First comes a season when land shifts from owner to owner; next one wherein it passes to a permanent state of individual or joint property.

Agri.—This, I think, has a double import, according to its relation.

a. As opposed to *arva* it means land in grass, wood, or fen, in contradistinction to land under the plough.

b. As opposed to land which has been divided and apportioned, it means land *un*apportioned or *un*divided.

Agri pro numero, &c.—The proper commentator upon this difficult section is some conveyancer learned in ethnology, rather than a simple ethnologist.

The separate *words*, however, must first be considered.

Arva.—Arable land.

Per annos.—Annually; *every* year.

Mutant.—From a crop to a fallow; not from one holder to another.

Superest.—Stands over to spare; is abundant—as *ne ferrum quidem* superest (§ 6)=*There is no excess even of iron.*

Sola—seges.—Corn (wheat and barley, § 23), to the exclusion of green crops, pulse, and vegetables.

Hiems, et ver, et æstas.—*Winter*, *spring* (*for-aar* Danish, *fruhjahr* German=*for-year*), and *summer*. Such are the only *Germanic* names of the seasons, even in the present English; *autumn* being of Latin origin. *Fall* (in America), *back-end* (in more than one provincial dialect), and *harvest* are all—though of native origin—recent terms.

I cannot realize the nature of the tenure here noticed. The limited *tenure* expressed by *per vices* cannot well have consisted in a certain allotment as private property, accompanied by a certain share in an undivided common; though such has been the view of careful writers.

The word *mox* complicates this view. For the occupation in the first instance (*pro numero cultorum, ab universis per vices*) we find no trace of individual possession; for that in the second (*partitio secundùm dignitatem*) none of joint ownership. Yet *mox* implies that the two forms were *successive* rather than simultaneous.

That there was much *joint* occupancy, except on the Marches, I am slow to believe. The house, at least, was permanent. So must the farms occupied by the *servi* of § 25 have been. The whole tenor of German history goes the same way.

It is safe, then, to hold with Mr. Kemble, that when the Germans "changed the arable year to year, there was land to spare," that is, for commons, "and pasture; but it does not amount to a proof that settled property in land was not part of the Teutonic scheme; it implies no more than this, that within the *Mark*, which was the property of all, what was this year one man's cornland might the next be another man's fallow; a process very intelligible to those who know anything of the system of cultivation, yet prevalent in

parts of Germany, or have ever had interest in what we call Lammas Meadows."

This even seems too much—to say nothing about the difficulty attached to the words *another man's fallow*. What could such a fallow be? Not for corn; since the land had been cropped by the previous owner. Not for a green crop; since there were none such known. Not for the *herbage*, *i.e.*, the weeds and after-growth of the harvest, which, in some parts, of England, is worth from two to three shillings *per* acre. The harvests of Germany are too late for this.

I think that the sentence of Tacitus has so little to do with the *tenure* of land at all, that it must be taken with what follows rather than with what precedes; in which case it applies to the *husbandry* only—not to the laws of landed property.

Nothing but *corn* was grown. This was new to an Italian: who had seen vetches, flax, and so many other products taken off the same land in either succession or rotation. As a consequence of this—

There was no such thing as a second crop on the same land without an interval.

This was also new to an Italian. The abundance of land, however, allows it.

As far, then, as the present passage goes, the *arvum*, which has just borne a crop, although left to nature, is as much the property of the original owner, in the intervals between two tilths, as it was during the seed-time and harvest.

The difficulties connected with the *tenure* of the land it neither removes nor increases.

By considering the statement as one for which *Cæsar* rather than Tacitus is responsible, and by limiting the account in Cæsar to the occupancy of the lands of the Sequani, dispossessed by Ariovistus, we approach a solution.

We are, then, at liberty to consider an occupation which is at one and the same time imperfect, and temporary, in the light of abnormal tenure, adapted to the country of a conquered enemy only. Yet, even then, the details are remarkable. Was the *occupatio per vices*, a mere quartering of *successive* bodies of warriors (warriors only) upon recently invaded, and imperfectly subdued districts, and the subsequent *partitio*, the distribution of the land of such districts after the conquest had become complete, the possession assured, and

the conversion of chieftains and captains into comparatively peaceable settlers had become practicable? Such a view would best reconcile Cæsar's statement with probability.

XXVII. Funerum nulla ambitio: id solùm observatur, ut corpora clarorum virorum certis lignis crementur.[1] Struem rogí nec vestibus, nec odoribus cumulant: sua cuique arma, quorumdam igni et equus adjicitur. Sepulcrum cespes erigit. Monumentorum arduum et operosum honorem, ut gravem defunctis, aspernantur. Lamenta ac lacrimas citò, dolorem et tristitiam tardè ponunt. Feminis lugere honestum est: viris meminisse.

NOTE ON SECTION XXVII.

[1] *Crementur.*]—The classification of the modern archæologists, founded upon that of the early Icelandic historians, divides by a pretty broad line of demarcation two periods.

a. In one the dead were *burned.*

b. In the other the dead were *buried.*

That the burning-time came down as late as the time of Tacitus is shown by the present passage.

XXVIII. Hæc in commune de omnium Germanorum origine ac moribus accepimus. Nunc singularum gentium instituta, ritusque, quatenus differant, quæ nationes e Germaniâ in Gallias commigraverint, expediam. Validiores olim[1] Gallorum res fuisse summus auctorum divus Julius tradit: eóque credibile est, etiam Gallos in Germaniam transgressos. Quantulum enim amnis obstabat, quominus, ut quæque gens eva-

luerat, occuparet permutaretque sedes promiscuas adhuc, et nullâ regnorum potentiâ divisas? Igitur inter Hercyniam silvam, Rhenumque et Mœnum amnes, Helvetii,[2] ulteriora Boii, Gallica utraque gens, tenuere. Manet adhuc *Boiemi* nomen,[3] significatque loci veterem memoriam, quamvis mutatis cultoribus. Sed utrùm Aravisci[4] in Pannoniam ab Osis, Germanorum natione,[5] an Osi ab Araviscis[6] in Germaniam commigraverint, cùm eodem adhuc sermone, institutis, moribus utantur, incertum est: quia pari olim inopiâ ac libertate, eadem utriusque ripæ bona malaque erant. Treviri[7] et Nervii[8] circa affectationem Germanicæ originis ultro ambitiosi sunt, tamquam per hanc gloriam sanguinis, a similitudine et inertiâ Gallorum separentur. Ipsam Rheni ripam haud dubiè Germanorum populi colunt, Vangiones,[9] Triboci,[10] Nemetes.[11] Ne Ubii[12] quidem, quamquam Romana colonia esse meruerint, ac libentiùs *Agrippinenses* conditoris sui nomine vocentur, origine erubescunt, trangressi olim, et experimento fidei super ipsam Rheni ripam collocati, ut arcerent, non ut custodirentur.

NOTES ON SECTION XXVIII.

[1] *Validiores olim, &c.*]—The chief passage in Cæsar is to be found in p. lxxxvii (*Prolegomena*)—*ac fuit antea tempus, &c.*

Criticism of the passage will separate the statement for which Cæsar, speaking upon his own knowledge, is responsible, from those which must be referred to his Gallic informants—these last speaking perhaps from history, perhaps from tradition, perhaps from inference, perhaps on no grounds at all beyond the wish to contrast their present inferiority to the Germans, with some more glorious epoch, when Gaul was the powerful, and Germany the weak country, when the Gauls encroached, and the Germans retreated. Such a time *may* have been a reality. It may also have been a dream.

That there was, at least, one body of Gauls on the German side of the Rhine, is a fact to which we have Cæsar as a witness. His language respecting the Volcæ Tectosages, is that of a man speaking to what he knows at first-hand.

For the locality of such Trans-Rhenane Gauls, in the time of Cæsar, no district has a better claim than Baden and Wurtemburg—the *agri Decumates* of Tacitus. We come to this conclusion by the exclusive method. It was not Switzerland, for that was Helvetian; nor yet the Middle Rhine, since, in those parts, there seems to have been Germans of the Alemannic division.

The import of the name *Volcæ Tectosages* is by no means clear. Of the two words composing it, the former (*Volcæ*) was generic, the latter (*Tectosages*) specific; since, besides the division in question, there was a second—the *Volcæ Arecomici.*

The area of the Volcæ of Gaul in general seems to have been the parts between the Rhone and the Pyrenees; but as the name was probably collective rather than special, the history of the *Volcæ* of Gaul is obscure. Cæsar mentions them only incidentally.

How the Gauls beyond the Rhine came thither is another question. They may have done so by simple intrusion, *i.e.*, just as Cæsar was told they did. This intrusion may have been either early or late—as late as the times approaching those of Cæsar himself, or earlier than the well-known migration—real or supposed—described by Livy, and referred to the reign of Tarquinius Priscus.—Lib. v. 34, 35.

" De transitu in Italiam Gallorum hæc accepimus. Prisco Tarquinio Romæ regnante, Celtarum, quæ pars Galliæ tertia est, penes Bituriges summa imperii fuit: ii regem Celtico dabant. Ambigatus is fuit, virtute fortunaque cum sua, tum publica, præpollens, quod imperio ejus Gallia adeo frugum hominumque fertilis fuit, ut abundans multitudo vix regi videretur posse. Hic magno natu ipse jam, exonerare prægravante turba regnum cupiens, Bellovesum ac Sigovesum, sororis filios, impigros juvenes, missurum se esse, in quas dii dedissent auguriis sedes, ostendit. Quantum ipsi vellent, numerum hominum excirent, ne qua gens arcere advenientes posset. Tum Sigoveso sortibus dati Hercynii saltus: Belloveso haud paullo lætiorem in Italiam viam dii dabant.

" Is, quod ejus ex populis abundabat, Bituriges, Arvernos, Senones, Æduos, Ambarros, Carnutes, Aulercos, excivit. Profectus,

ingentibus peditum equitumque copiis, in Tricastinos venit. Per Taurinos saltusque invios Alpes transcenderunt: fusisque acie Tuscis haud procul Ticino flumine, quum, in quo consederant, agrum Insubrium appellari audissent cognomine Insubribus pago Æduorum, ibi, omen sequentes loci, condidere urbem: Mediolanum appellarunt.

"Alia subinde manus Cenomanorum, Elitovio duce, vestigia priorum secuta, eodem saltu, favente Belloveso, quum transcendisset Alpes, ubi nunc Brixia ac Verona urbes sunt (locos tenuere Libui) considunt.

"Post hos Salluvii prope antiquam gentem Lævos Ligures, incolentes circa Ticinum amnem.

"Penino deinde Boii Lingonesque transgressi, quum jam inter Padum atque Alpes omnia tenerentur, Pado ratibus trajecto, non Etruscos modo, sed etiam Umbros agro pellunt: intra Apenninum tamen sese tenuere.

"Tum Senones, recentissimi advenarum, ab Utente flumine usque ad Æsim fines habuere. Hanc gentem Clusium, Romamque inde, venisse comperio."

To this add the following passage from Polybius:—

Ταῦτά γε τὰ πεδία τὸ παλαιὸν ἐνέμοντο Τυῤῥηνοί.. οἷς ἐπιμιγνύμενοι κατὰ τὴν παράθεσιν Κελτοὶ, καὶ περὶ τὸ κάλλος τῆς χώρας ὀφθαλμιάσαντες, ἐκ μικρᾶς προφάσεως μεγάλῃ στρατιᾷ παραδόξως ἐπελθόντες, ἐξέβαλον ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὸν Πάδον χώρας Τυῤῥηνοὺς καὶ κατέσχον αὐτοὶ τὰ πεδία. Τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀνατολὰς τοῦ Πάδου κείμενα Λᾶοι καὶ Λεβέκιοι, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἴσομβρες κατῴκησαν, ὃ μέγιστον ἔθνος ἦν αὐτῶν, ἑξῆς δὲ τούτοις παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν Κενομάνοι· τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδρίαν ἤδη προσήκοντα γένος ἄλλο πάνυ παλαιὸν διακατέσχε, προσαγορεύονται δὲ Οὐένετοι.. Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Πάδου τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἀπεννῖνον πρῶτοι μὲν Ἄνανες, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Βοιοὶ κατῴκησαν· ἑξῆς δὲ τούτων ὡς πρὸς τὸν Ἀδρίαν Αἴγωνες· τὰ δὲ τελευταῖα πρὸς θαλάττῃ Σήνωνες.—Polyb. ii. 17.

Assuming all this to be not only history, but *the* history of what may be called the *First Gallic Migration*, the Trans-Rhenane Gauls are accounted for. They are the descendants of the Gauls of Sigovesus.

But neither Polybius' nor Livy's account can well be considered historical. Where were the records for the time in question? The most that can be done in the way of connecting the Trans-Rhenane Gauls of Cæsar with the Gauls of Sigovesus, is to admit the common character of the tradition that applied to them.

But what if the Gauls of the right bank of the Rhine were no

intruders at all? What if they represented an originally Keltic population of south-western Germany? What if the *Germans* had been the encroachers? In this case our view changes; and they are the fragments of an old, rather than the rudiments of a new population, and the account of their migration is no *tradition* but an *inference;* an inference drawn from their eccentric locality, an inference which accounts for their outlying position, an inference incorrect, in fact, but an inference natural to imperfect speculators in ethnology.

I give no opinion as to how far this is likely to have been the case; the question it involves being one of great compass and subtilty; resting, as it does, upon some of the highest generalizations of the phenomena of human distribution and human migration.

The history—real or supposed—of these *Tectosages* is curious. The following account is in the words of Niebuhr.

"In the spring of the year after this, Cn. Manlius Vulso, the successor of L. Cornelius Scipio, anxious for an opportunity to undertake something from which he might derive fame and wealth—a desire which is henceforward the prevailing characteristic of the Roman generals—made a campaign against the Galatians, or Gallo-Græci, in Phrygia. In the time of Pyrrhus, these Gauls had penetrated through Macedonia into Greece, as far as Delphi; afterwards they went eastward to Thrace; but whether they were, as the Greeks relate, induced to do so by fearful natural phenomena, or were attracted by reports about the delightful countries of Asia, is uncertain. Many remained in Thrace, and ruled over the country; but others, twenty thousand in number, crossed over into Asia, in two divisions, the one going across the Hellespont, and the other across the Bosporus, and their enterprise was facilitated by the feuds of the Asiatic princes. There they settled on the northern coast, in the territory about Ancyra, in Phrygia, just as, at a later period, the Normans did in Neustria. They inhabited thirty-three towns, in a country which, though it seems to have been destined by Providence to be one of the most flourishing and happy in the world, is now, under the despotism of barbarians, like an accursed desert. They consisted of three tribes, bearing the strange names of Trocmi, Tolistoboii, and Tectosagæ. The first two seem to have been formed during their wanderings, for they are not mentioned elsewhere. They united with the Bithynians, where two small kingdoms were growing up. The Bithynians were Thracians settled between Nico-

media and Heraclea; during the time of the Persian dominion they were governed by native princes, and after the dissolution of the Persian and Macedonian empires, the latter of which had always been least consolidated in Asia Minor, they extended themselves, and acquired considerable importance. Nicomedes, then king, took those Gauls into his pay, there being then only ten thousand armed men among them, defeated his rival, and founded the Bithynian state, which gradually became Hellenised. From that time, the Gauls sold their services to any one who might seek them, and made the whole of western Asia tributary to themselves. Their history is yet in great confusion; but it can be cleared up, many materials existing for it. They were defeated by Antiochus Soter, whereupon they withdrew into the mountains, whence they afterwards burst forth whenever circumstances allowed them, and all the neighbouring nations paid tribute, to escape their devastations. But when the war between Ptolemy Euergetes and Seleucus Callinicus, and afterwards that between the former and Antiochus Hierax broke out, they showed themselves thoroughly faithless, selling themselves sometimes to the one, sometimes to the other, and were the scourge of all Asia, until, to the amazement of every body, Attalus of Pergamus refused to pay tribute, attacked and defeated them, a fact which can be accounted for only on the supposition, that through idleness they had become quite effeminate and unwarlike, like the Goths whom Belisarius found in Italy. They never entirely recovered from this blow, though they still continued to exercise considerable influence, for Asia was always divided; and although Antiochus was staying in those countries, he was too much occupied to turn his attention to them, and would not, moreover, have been able to protect that part of Phrygia bordering on the district inhabited by the Gauls. Hence they still levied tribute far and wide, and after the fall of Antiochus, the Asiatic nations dreaded lest they should be unable to defend themselves. This gave Cn. Manlius an opportunity of undertaking a campaign against them, and to come forward as the protector of the Asiatics against the Galatians. His demand that they should submit had been answered by those barbarians with a *stolida ferocia*, and he accordingly marched through Phrygia, and attacked them in their mountains, without, however, extirpating them. They continued in those districts, and preserved their Celtic language for a remarkably long period. We find it even in the time of Augustus; but they, too, became Hellenised,

and in this condition we find them at the time of St. Paul. The campaign of Manlius Vulso against them was most desirable to the inhabitants of Asia Minor, but on the part of the Romans, it was very unjust, for Manlius Vulso undertook it contrary to the express will of the *decem legati* who followed him to Asia. The war was brought to a close in two campaigns, but the Romans derived no advantages from it, except the booty, and perhaps a sum of money which was paid to them; for the countries between Western Asia and the districts of the Galatians were not subject to the Romans, but only allied with them. The Galatians suffered so severe a defeat, that from this time forward they continued to live in quiet obedience to the Romans."

To the existence of *Galli*, *Galatæ*, or *Gallo-Græci* in Phrygia, I take no exceptions. The following passage in Livy contains the very name in question:—"Non plus ex viginti millibus hominum, quam decem armata erant. Tamen tantum terroris omnibus, quæ cis Taurum incolunt, gentibus injecerunt, ut, quas adissent quasque non adissent, pariter ultimæ propinquis, imperio parerent. Postremo, quum tres essent gentes, *Tolistoboii*, *Trocmi*, *Tectosagi*, in tres partes, qua cuique populorum suorum vectigalis Asia esset, diviserunt. *Trocmis* Hellesponti ora data; *Tolistoboii* Æolida atque Ioniam; *Tectosagi* mediterranea Asiæ sortiti sunt, et stipendium tota cis Taurum Asia exigebant. Sedem autem ipsi sibi circa Halyn flumen ceperunt; tantusque terror eorum nominis erat, multitudine etiam magna sobole aucta, ut Syriæ quoque ad postremum reges stipendium dare non abnuerent. Primus Asiam incolentium abnuit Attalus, pater regis Eumenis."

Further notice of this obscure question is taken in not. ad v. *Treviri*.

[2] *Helvetii.*]—Much as is said about *national* migrations, as opposed to the mere movements of great armies, containing only the male portion of the population, there are but few, very few, for which we have the unexceptionable evidence of contemporary witnesses, and fewer still where we have an account of the details.

Of the absolute evacuation of the original country there is no recorded instance—except in the case of habitually migratory tribes, to whom agriculture is unknown.

Indeed, it is doubtful whether any movement of the kind in question, beyond that of a vast army with a proportionate number

of camp-followers (thus involving the presence of a certain number of women and children) has ever been recorded. The nearest recorded approach to such, in *modern* times, is the return of the Kalmuk Mongols, from the parts between the Don and Volga, to their original home in Western Mongolia. Here, old and young, male and female, joined the migration, and the original locality was well-nigh emptied of its Mongolians. Yet this was under peculiar circumstances. The population which thus set itself in movement was not seeking a new seat (*novas sedes*), but returning to the country from whence it originally came, and to which it naturally belonged. The search after a fresh locality is part and parcel of our ideas of a *migration*. If the Jews from all parts of the world were to return and re-people Palestine, we might, perhaps, coin the term *re*-migration, but I do not think we should talk of the *Jewish migration*. If such be the case, the return of the Kalmuks is only an *approach* to a migration of the kind so often assumed.

I give Cæsar's account of the Helvetic migration in full.

CÆS. BELL. GALL. LIB. I.

II. Apud Helvetios longe nobilissimus et ditissimus fuit Orgetorix. Is M. Messala et M. Pisone Coss. regni cupiditate inductus, conjurationem nobilitatis fecit et civitati persuasit, ut de finibus suis cum omnibus copiis exirent: perfacile esse, quum virtute omnibus præstarent, totius Galliæ imperio potiri. Id hoc facilius eis persuasit, quod undique loci natura Helvetii continentur: una ex parte flumine Rheno, latissimo atque altissimo, qui agrum Helvetium a Germanis dividit; altera ex parte monte Jura altissimo, qui est inter Sequanos et Helvetios; tertia lacu Lemanno et flumine Rhodano, qui provinciam nostram ab Helvetiis dividit. His rebus fiebat, ut et minus late vagarentur, et minus facile finitimis bellum inferre possent: qua de caussa homines bellandi cupidi magno dolore adficiebantur. Pro multitudine autem hominum, et pro gloria belli atque fortitudinis, angustos se fines habere arbitrabantur, qui in longitudinem millia passuum CCXL., in latitudinem CLXXX. patebant.

III. His rebus adducti, et auctoritate Orgetorigis permoti, constituerunt, ea, quæ ad profiscendum pertinerent, comparare; jumentorum et carrorum quam maximum numerum coemere; sementes quam maximas facere, ut in itinere copia frumenti suppeteret; cum proximis civitatibus pacem et amicitiam confirmare. Ad eas res conficiendas biennium sibi satis esse duxerunt; in tertium annum

profectionem lege confirmant. Ad eas res conficiendas Orgetorix deligitur. Is, ubi legationem ad civitates suscepit, in eo itinere persuadet Castico, Catamantaledis filio, Sequano, cujus pater regnum in Sequanis multos annos obtinuerat, et a senatu populi Romani amicus adpellatus erat, ut regnum in civitate sua occuparet, quod pater ante habuerat: itemque Dumnorigi Æduo, fratri Divitiaci, qui eo tempore principatum in civitate obtinebat ac maxime plebi acceptus erat, ut idem conaretur, persuadet, eique filiam suam in matrimonium dat. Perfacile factu esse, illis probat, conata perficere, propterea quod ipse suæ civitatis imperium obtenturus esset: non esse dubium, quin totius Galliæ plurimum Helvetii possent: se suis copiis suoque exercitu illis regna conciliaturum, confirmat. Hac oratione adducti, inter se fidem et jusjurandum dant et, regno occupato, per tres potentissimos ac firmissimos populos totius Galliæ sese potiri posse sperant.

IV. Ea res ut est Helvetiis per indicium enunciata, moribus suis Orgetorigem ex vinculis caussam dicere coegerunt: damnatum pœnam sequi oportebat, ut igni cremaretur. Die constituta caussæ dictionis, Orgetorix ad judicium omnem suam familiam, ad hominum millia decem, undique coegit et omnes clientes obæratosque suos, quorum magnum numerum habebat, eodem conduxit: per eos, ne caussam diceret, se eripuit. Quum civitas, ob eam rem incitata armis jus suum exsequi conaretur multitudinemque hominum ex agris magistratus cogerent, Orgetorix mortuus est: neque abest suspicio, ut Helvetii arbitrantur, quin ipse sibi mortem consciverit.

V. Post ejus mortem nihilo minus Helvetii id, quod constituerant, facere conantur, ut e finibus suis exeant. Ubi jam se ad eam rem paratos esse arbitrati sunt, oppida sua omnia, numero ad duodecim, vicos ad quadringentos, reliqua privata ædificia incendunt, frumentum omne, præter quod secum portaturi erant, comburunt, ut, domum reditionis spe sublata, paratiores ad omnia pericula subeunda essent: trium mensium molita cibaria sibi quemque domo efferre jubent. Persuadent Rauracis et Tulingis et Latobrigis finitimis, uti, eodem usi consilio, oppidis suis vicisque exustis, una cum iis proficiscantur: Boiosque, qui trans Rhenum incoluerant et in agrum Noricum transierant Noreiamque oppugnarant, receptos ad se socios sibi adsciscunt.

VI. Erant omnino itinera duo, quibus itineribus domo exire possent: unum per Sequanos, angustum et difficile, inter montem Juram et flumen Rhodanum, vix qua singuli carri ducerentur; mons

autem altissimus impendebat, ut facile perpauci prohibere possent: alterum per provinciam nostram, multo facilius atque expeditius, propterea quod Helvetiorum inter fines et Allobrogum, qui nuper pacati erant, Rhodanus fluit, isque nonnullis locis vado transitur. Extremum oppidum Allobrogum est proximumque Helvetiorum finibus, Geneva. Ex eo oppido pons ad Helvetios pertinet. Allobrogibus sese vel persuasuros, quod nondum bono animo in populum Romanum viderentur, existimabant; vel vi coacturos, ut per suos fines eos ire paterentur. Omnibus rebus ad profectionem comparatis, diem dicunt, qua die ad ripam Rhodani omnes conveniant: is dies erat a. d. V. Kal. Apr. L. Pisone, A. Gabinio Coss.

VII. Cæsari quum id nunciatum esset, eos per provinciam nostram iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci; et, quam maximis potest itineribus, in Galliam ulteriorem contendit et ad Genevam pervenit: provinciæ toti quam maximum potest militum numerum imperat (erat omnino in Gallia ulteriore legio una): pontem, qui erat ad Genevam, jubet rescindi. Ubi de ejus adventu Helvetii certiores facti sunt, legatos ad eum mittunt, nobilissimos civitatis, cujus legationis Nameius et Verudoctius principem locum obtinebant, qui dicerent "sibi esse in animo, sine ullo maleficio iter per provinciam facere, propterea quod aliud iter haberent nullum: rogare, ut ejus voluntate id sibi facere liceat." Cæsar, quod memoria tenebat, L. Cassium consulem occisum, exercitumque ejus ab Helvetiis pulsum et sub jugum missum, concedendum non putabat: neque homines inimico animo, data facultate per provinciam itineris faciundi, temperaturos ab injuria et maleficio existimabat. Tamen, ut spatium intercedere posset, dum milites, quos imperaverat, convenirent, legatis respondit, "diem se ad deliberandum sumturum; si quid vellent, a. d. Idus Apr. reverterentur."

VIII. Interea ea legione, quam secum habebat, militibusque, qui ex provincia convenerant, a lacu Lemanno, qui in flumen Rhodanum influit, ad montem Juram, qui fines Sequanorum ab Helvetiis dividit, millia passuum decem novem murum, in altitudinem pedum sedecim, fossamque perducit. Eo opere perfecto, præsidia disponit, castella communit, quo facilius, si se invito transire conarentur, prohibere possit. Ubi ea dies, quam constituerat cum legatis, venit, et legati ad eum reverterunt, negat, "se more et exemplo populi Romani posse iter ulli per provinciam dare; et, si vim facere conentur, prohibiturum" ostendit. Helvetii, ea spe dejecti, navibus junctis ratibusque compluribus factis, alii vadis Rhodani, qua minima altitudo fluminis

erat, nonnunquam interdiu, sæpius noctu, si perrumpere possent, conati, operis munitione et militum concursu et telis repulsi, hoc conatu destiterunt.

IX. Relinquebatur una per Sequanos via, qua, Sequanis invitis, propter angustias ire non poterant. His quum sua sponte persuadere non possent, legatos ad Dumnorigem Æduum mittunt, ut eo deprecatore a Sequanis impetrarent. Dumnorix gratia et largitione apud Sequanos plurimum poterat et Helvetiis erat amicus, quod ex ea civitate Orgetorigis filiam in matrimonium duxerat, et cupiditate regni adductus novis rebus studebat et quam plurimas civitates suo sibi beneficio habere obstrictas volebat. Itaque rem suscipit et a Sequanis impetrat, ut per fines suos ire Helvetios patiantur, obsidesque uti inter sese dent, perficit: Sequani, ne itinere Helvetios prohibeant; Helvetii, ut sine maleficio et injuria transeant.

X. Cæsari renuntiatur, Helvetiis esse in animo, per agrum Sequanorum et Æduorum iter in Santonum fines facere, qui non longe a Tolosatium finibus absunt, quæ civitas est in provincia. Id si fieret, intelligebat, magno cum periculo provinciæ futurum, ut homines bellicosos, populi Romani inimicos, locis patentibus maximeque frumentariis finitimos haberet. Ob eas caussas ei munitioni, quam fecerat, T. Labienum legatum præfecit: ipse in Italiam magnis itineribus contendit, duasque ibi legiones conscribit et tres, quæ circum Aquileiam hiemabant, ex hibernis educit et, qua proximum iter in ulteriorem Galliam per Alpes erat, cum his quinque legionibus ire contendit. Ibi Centrones et Graioceli et Caturiges, locis superioribus occupatis, itinere exercitum prohibere conantur. Compluribus his prœliis pulsis, ab Ocelo, quod est citerioris provinciæ extremum, in fines Vocontiorum ulterioris provinciæ die septimo pervenit: inde in Allobrogum fines, ab Allobrogibus in Segusianos exercitum ducit. Hi sunt extra provinciam trans Rhodanum primi.

XI. Helvetii jam per angustias et fines Sequanorum suas copias transduxerant et in Æduorum fines pervenerant eorumque agros populabantur. Ædui, quum se suaque ab iis defendere non possent, legatos ad Cæsarem mittunt rogatum auxilium: "ita se omni tempore de populo Romano meritos esse, ut pæne in conspectu exercitus nostri agri vastari, liberi eorum in servitutem abduci, oppida expugnari non debuerint." Eodem tempore Ambarri, necessarii et consanguinei Æduorum, Cæsarem certiorem faciunt, sese, depopulatis agris, non facile ab oppidis vim hostium prohibere: item Allobroges, qui trans Rhodanum vicos possessionesque habebant, fuga se ad Cæsarem

recipiunt et demonstrant, sibi præter agri solum nihil esse reliqui. Quibus rebus adductus Cæsar, non exspectandum sibi statuit, dum, omnibus fortunis sociorum consumtis, in Santonos Helvetii pervenirent.

XII. Flumen est Arar, quod per fines Æduorum et Sequanorum in Rhodanum influit incredibili lenitate, ita ut oculis, in utram partem fluat, judicari non possit. Id Helvetii ratibus ac lintribus junctis transibant. Ubi per exploratores Cæsar certior factus est, tres jam copiarum partes Helvetios id flumen transduxisse, quartam vero partem citra flumen Ararim reliquam esse: de tertia vigilia cum legionibus tribus e castris profectus, ad eam partem pervenit, quæ nondum flumen transierat. Eos impeditos et inopinantes adgressus, magnam eorum partem concidit: reliqui fugæ sese mandarunt atque in proximas silvas abdiderunt. Is pagus adpellabatur Tigurinus: nam omnis civitas Helvetia in quatuor pagos divisa est. Hic pagus unus, quum domo exisset, patrum nostrorum memoria L. Cassium consulem interfecerat et ejus exercitum sub jugum miserat. Ita, sive casu, sive consilio deorum immortalium, quæ pars civitatis Helvetiæ insignem calamitatem populo Romano intulerat, ea princeps pœnas persolvit.

* * * * * *

XXVII. Helvetii, omnium rerum inopia adducti, legatos de deditione ad eum miserunt. Qui quum eum in itinere convenissent seque ad pedes projecissent suppliciterque locuti flentes pacem petissent, atque eos in eo loco, quo tum essent, suum adventum exspectare jussisset, paruerunt. Eo postquam Cæsar pervenit, obsides, arma, servos, qui ad eos perfugissent, poposcit. Dum ea conquiruntur et conferuntur, nocte intermissa, circiter hominum millia VI. ejus pagi, qui Verbigenus adpellatur, sive timore perterriti, ne armis traditis supplicio adficerentur, sive spe salutis inducti, quod, in tanta multitudine dedititiorum, suam fugam aut occultari, aut omnino ignorari posse existimarent, prima nocte e castris Helvetiorum egressi, ad Rhenum finesque Germanorum contenderunt.

XXVIII. Quod ubi Cæsar resciit, quorum per fines ierant, his, uti conquirerent et reducerent, si sibi purgati esse vellent, imperavit: reductos in hostium numero habuit: reliquos omnes, obsidibus, armis, perfugis traditis, in deditionem accepit. Helvetios, Tulingos, Latobrigos in fines suos, unde erant profecti, reverti jussit; et quod, omnibus fructibus amissis, domi nihil erat, quo famem tolerarent,

Allobrogibus imperavit, ut iis frumenti copiam facerent: ipsos oppida vicosque, quos incenderant, restituere jussit. Id ea maxime ratione fecit, quod noluit, eum locum, unde Helvetii discesserant, vacare; ne propter bonitatem agrorum Germani, qui trans Rhenum incolunt, e suis finibus in Helvetiorum fines transirent, et finitimi Galliæ provinciæ Allobrogibusque essent. Boios, petentibus Æduis, quod egregia virtute erant cogniti, ut in finibus suis collocarent, concessit: quibus illi agros dederunt, quosque postea in parem juris libertatisque conditionem, atque ipsi erant, receperunt.

XXIX. In castris Helvetiorum tabulæ repertæ sunt, litteris Græcis confectæ, et ad Cæsarem relatæ, quibus in tabulis nominatim ratio confecta erat, qui numerus domo exisset eorum, qui arma ferre possent: et item separatim pueri, senes, mulieresque. Quarum omnium rerum summa erat, capitum Helvetiorum millia CCLXIII., Tulingorum millia XXXVI., Latobrigorum XIV., Rauracorum XXIII., Boiorum XXXII.: ex his, qui arma ferre possent, ad millia XCII. Summa omnium fuerunt ad millia CCCLXVIII. Eorum, qui domum redierunt, censu habito, ut Cæsar imperaverat, repertus est numerus millium C. et X.

The *Deserta Helvetiorum* I believe to have been, not the waste tract left by any emigrant Helvetii, but the waste tract left as a *March* on the Helveto-Germanic frontier; a waste, most probably, of German rather than Gallic making.

[3] *Boiemi nomen, &c.*] — Zeuss considers that the present passage in Tacitus is the complement to the statement of Cæsar; and that the former fills up the holes left by the latter, "Erst Tacitus, die Lücken, die Cæsar gelassen hat, ausfüllend berichtet darüber, *validiores, &c.*" (p. 171.)

I do not think this. Tacitus merely assents to the reasonableness of Cæsar's opinion as to the Gauls having once encroached upon the Germans, instead of (as in his time) retiring before them, and confirms it with the fresh instance involved in the name *Boiohem*. He also justifies us in carrying the Gauls of Germany as far north as the Maine.

But the important word is the compound *Boi-o-hem-um*.

It was a name well known to the Romans; and this allows Tacitus to bestow little more than a passing allusion to it.

The writers who first use it are Paterculus and Strabo. See *Prolegomena*.

It is truly and unequivocally German—a German gloss. The *-hem* = *occupation, residence,* being the same word as the *-heim* in *Mann-heim* in High German; the *-hem* in *Arn-hem* in Dutch; the *-um* in Dokk-*um* in Frisian; the *-ham* in *Threking-ham* in English. Hence *Boi-o-hem-um*=*the home of the Boii.* As a gloss, its unequivocal character is on the same high level with the compound *Marc-o-manni.* No one, however much opposed to etymological guess-work, has ever objected to either.

Word for word, and element for element, *Boiohemum* is the same as *Bohemia.*

Some of the other compounds of the root *Boi-* are interesting.

Be-heim-are, a triple compound, or a decomposite, combines the elements of both *Ba-varia* and *Bo-hem-ia,* and stands for *Be-heim-ware*=the *occupants of the home of the Boii.*

Boe-manni=*the Boian men.*

Beo-winidi=*the Boian Wends,* or Slavonians.

With the exception of the compound *Marc-o-manni,* no German gloss was more current in Rome than the word in question. Strabo has it, *'Εστὶ καὶ τὸ Βουΐαιμον τὸ τοῦ Μαροβούδου βασίλειον, εἰς ὃν ἐκεῖνος τόπον ἄλλους τε μετανέστησε πλείους, καὶ δὴ τοὺς ὁμοεθνεῖς ἑαυτῷ Μαρκομμάνους.*—Strabo, vii. 1.

Ptolemy's form is Βαινοχαῖμαι; a form taken from some dialect where the *h* was pronounced as a stronger guttural than elsewhere.

Word for word, and element for element, *Boiohemum*=*Bohemia;* but whether the *localities* coincide as closely as the forms of the *name,* is another question. It has been too readily assumed that they do.

It cannot be denied that identity of name is *primâ facie* evidence of identity of place. But it is not more. Hence, although it would be likely enough, if the question were wholly uncomplicated, that the *Boiohemum* of Paterculus were the *Bohemia* of the present century, doubts arise as soon as the name and the description disagree, and they increase when the identification of either the Boii, or their German invaders, with the inhabitants of Bohemia leads to ethnological and geographical difficulties.

All this is really the case.

The disagreement between the name *Boio-hem* and the position of the present country of *Bohemia* meets us in the very passage before us. The former lies between the Maine, the Rhine, and the Hercynian Forest. No part of Bohemia is thus bounded.

As to the history of the Boii, it is one of great prominence and

importance. But what is that of the geographical area now called Bohemia? So unknown was that remarkable country to the Greeks and Romans, that its obscurity was that of the central parts of Africa in our own time. There was a reason for this. Its natural mountain-rampart would preserve it from invasion.

Those same mountain-ramparts, however, which would thus tend to keep the country inviolate, in the case of a war, could hardly escape notice and description. Yet no such notices and descriptions exist. Of the present Bohemia, we find no *unequivocal* account whatever in any Roman writer. *Equivocal* accounts we *do* find: but these are got at by assuming the Marcomannic kingdom of Maroboduus to have lain within Bohemia, and as they apply to this Marcomannic kingdom only, they cease to be Bohemian as soon as the Marcomanni are placed elsewhere.

It may simplify the question to anticipate.

I believe the *Boi-o-hem-um* of Tacitus to have been, not Bohemia, but *Bavaria.*

Bavaria and *Bohemia* are nearly the same words.

a. The first element in each is the proper name *Boii.* In the sixth and seventh centuries the fuller form of Bavaria is *Bojo-aria, Bai-varia, Bajo-aria, Baiu-varii,* &c.

b. The second element is equivalent *in power,* though not *in form,* to the second element in *Bo-hemia.* It is the word *ware=inhabitants* or *occupants* in the Anglo-Saxon form, *Cantware=people of Kent.*

Hence *Bohemia*=the *Boian occupancy; Bavaria=the occupant Boians.*

This leads us to the fact that however much we may place the *Boii* in *Bo-hemia,* we cannot do so *exclusively.* As far as the name goes, there were *Boii* in Bavaria as well; Boii, too, who gave their name to their land.

But this is not enough. We require substantive proof beyond the inference arising from the similarity of name for this latter fact. At present the argument stands thus:—

Boiohem, in the time of Tacitus, meant *Bavaria.* Not so, may be the answer. It is granted that only one locality may be intended by the two names, but why may not *Bavaria* originally have meant Bohemia? The answer to this must rest on its own grounds.

It is no small argument in favour of the original single power of the two names, to find that the alternative just indicated is a real one. Zeuss expends much learning upon it, giving reasons

for believing not that the Boii of Bavaria were one people, whilst the Boii of Bohemia were another, nor yet that that name Bohemia originally meant Bavaria, but that *Bavaria = Bohemia.*

I reverse Zeuss's view, believing that *Boihemis=Bavaria.* The Boio-*hemum* of Tacitus (as already stated) is certainly *more Bavarian than Bohemian.*

So is that of Strabo; every association of the Boii of the following passage is with the populations so far south, as to make Bavaria a more likely locality for them than Bohemia.

Βοιρεβίστης . . Βοΐους καὶ ἄρδην ἠφάνισε τοὺς ὑπὸ Κριτασίρῳ, καὶ Ταυρίσκους.—Str. vii. p. 304. Τὰ Ἰλλυρικὰ . . ἀρξάμενα ἀπὸ τῆς λίμνης τῆς κατὰ τοὺς Οὐϊνδελικοὺς καὶ Ῥαιτοὺς καὶ Τοινίους. Μέρος μὲν δή τι τῆς χώρας ταύτης ἠρήμωσαν οἱ Δάκοι καταπολεμήσαντες Βοΐους καὶ Ταυρίσκους, ἔθνη Κελτικά, τὰ ὑπὸ Κριτοσίρῳ.—Id. p. 313.

Again—

Μέγιστα ἦν τῶν Κελτῶν ἔθνη Βοΐοι, καὶ Ἴνσουβροι, καὶ οἱ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐξ ἐφόδου καταλαβόντες Σένωνες μετὰ Γαισατῶν· τούτους μὲν οὖν ἐξέφθειραν ὕστερον τελέως Ῥωμαῖοι. Τοὺς δὲ Βοΐους ἐξήλασαν ἐκ τῶν τόπων· μεταστάντες δ' εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἴστρον τόπους, μετὰ Ταυρίσκων ᾤκουν· πολεμοῦντες πρὸς Δάκας, ἕως ἀπώλοντο πανεθνεί· τὴν δὲ χώραν οὖσαν τῆς Ἰλλυρίδος μηλόβοτον τοῖς περιοικοῦσι κατέλιπον.—v. p. 242, 243. Ἐντὸς τοῦ Πάδου . . κατεῖχον δὲ Βοΐοι καὶ Λίγυες, καὶ Σένωνες, καὶ Γαισάται τὸ πλέον· τῶν δὲ Βοΐων ἐξελαθέντων, ἀφανισθέντων δὲ καὶ τῶν Γαισατῶν, καὶ Σενώνων, λείπεται τὰ Λιγυστικὰ φῦλα, καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων αἱ ἀποικίαι.—p. 216.

Again—

Κατέχουσι δὲ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν (Παννονίαν τὴν ἄνω), ἐν μὲν τοῖς πρὸς ἄρκτους μέρεσιν, Ἄζαλοι μὲν δυσμικώτεροι. Κύτνοι δ' ἀνατολικώτεροι· ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεσημβρινοῖς, Λατόβικοι μὲν, ὑπὸ τὸ Νωρικόν. Οὐαρκιανοὶ δὲ τὰ πρὸς ἀνατολάς· ἐν δὲ τοῖς μεταξὺ, Βοιοὶ μὲν πρὸς δυσμάς, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοὺς, Κολετιανοί. Ἰάσσιοι δὲ πρὸς ἀνατολάς, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοὺς, Ὀσεριάτες.—Ptolem. Geog. ii. 14.

Κατέχουσι δὲ καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἐπαρχίαν (Παννονίαν τὴν κάτω), ἐν μὲν τοῖς δυσμικοῖς μέρεσιν, Ἀμαντινοὶ ἀρκτικώτεροι· ὑφ' οὓς Ἐρκουνιάτες, εἶτα Ἀνδιάντες, εἶτα Βρεῦκοι· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνατολικοῖς, ἀρκτικώτατοι μὲν, Ἀραβίσκοι· μεσημβρινώτεροι δὲ Σκορδίσκοι.—Ib. ii. 15.

In the reference to Posidonius we have an older authority than that of either Strabo himself, or Cæsar.

Φησὶ δὲ καὶ (ὁ Ποσειδώνιος) Βοΐους τὸν Ἑρκύνιον δρυμὸν οἰκεῖν πρότερον· τοὺς δὲ Κίμβρους ὁρμήσαντας ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον,

ἀποκρουσθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν Βοΐων ἐπὶ τὸν Ἴστρον . . . καταβῆναι.—Str. vii. 1.

Cæsar's evidence goes the same way. His *Bohemia* joined Noricum, which our Bohemia does not—"Boiosque, qui trans Rhenum incoluerant, et in agrum Noricum transierant, Noreiamque oppugnarant, receptos ad se socios sibi adsciscunt."—Bell. Gall. i. 5.

So does that of the following inscription:—L. VOLCATIO Q. F. VEL. PRIMO. PRÆF. COH. I. NORICOR. IN PANN. PRÆF. RIPÆ DANVVI. ET CIVITATUM DUARUM BOIORUM ET AZALIORUM.—Gruter, 490, 2.

We may now trace the name *Bavaria*. In the geographer of Ravenna is the following corrupt passage:—"Est patria quæ dicitur *Albis* ungani (?) montuosa per longum, quæ ad orientem multum extenditur, cujus aliqua pars *Baias* dicitur."

It is in the same geographer that the name *Baio-varii* first occurs.

Zeuss's reasoning is that *Baias*=*Bohemia*; that the *Baio-varii* came from thence, and that changing their places they changed the form of their name also. "The *Baiovarii*, *Paigira*, *Baiern* are from the country *Baia*. This population changed its locality with its name."=Die Baiovarii, Paigira, Baiern sind die aus dem lande *Baia*. Mit seinem namen ändert das Volk auch seine Sitze."—pp. 367, 368.

No one need admit more freely than Zeuss, that all evidence of this migration of the *Baians* from Bohemia is wanting; as well as that there is no evidence of *Bohemia* having ever been called *Bavaria*.

I collect, too, from his numerous and valuable quotations, that—

1. The evidence of the present country of *Bavaria* being called by a compound of *Boio*+*ware*, begins as early as the sixth century.

2. That the evidence of the present country of *Bohemia* being called by a compound of *Boio*+*heim* is no earlier than the eleventh.

I also collect from the same data, that, though the Bavarians of Bavaria are called *Boii* as late as the eleventh century, there is no instance of the *Bohemians* being so called—save and except in the equivocal case of the *Baia* of the geographer of Ravenna.

This reduces the evidence of the old *Boio*-hemum being Bo-*hemia* to two facts—

1. The name *Baia*; supposed to mean *Bohemia*, from the fact of its being on the water-system of the Elbe. But *Albis* here may mean the Saale. See not. in v. *Hermunduri*.

2. The present name Bo-*hemia*.

But, this is—

a. Recent in origin.

b. *German* rather than *Tshekh*, or true Bohemian, and not originally even German, but *Gallic*.

c. Mutilated in form—since, though we in England say *Bohemia* from *Boio-heim*, the German name is *Boh-m-en=Bo-hem-ians.*

The arguments founded on this are, surely, *by themselves*, weak. Granted. But we must take them along with the facts involved in the *Bohemian* empire of Maroboduus, and *Bohemian* Marcomanni. Yes. But all this is also exceptionable.

The only *un*-exceptionable series of facts is that which connects the *home of the Boii* with *Bavaria=the Boian occupants.*

This justifies us in thinking *Bohemia* is a modern name, even as *Belgium* is; from which it differs in degree only; *i.e.* in being eight hundred years earlier.

That it as little grew *directly and continuously* out of the *Boii* as *Belgium* did from the *Belgæ*, is nearly certain.

The *Deserta Boiorum* I believe to have been, not the waste tract left by any emigrant Boii, but the waste tract left as a March on the Boio-Germanic frontier; a waste, most probably, of German rather than Gallic making.

[4] *Aravisci.*]—Their locality was the most north-eastern part of Pannonia. The termination *-sci* is common in these parts for some distance southwards, *e.g.*, in the names Scord-*isci*, Taur-*isci*, &c.

[5] *Osis, Germanorum natione.*]—If we took these words by themselves we should say, at once, that the *Osi* were Germans in respect to their ethnological position. That they are not so, is shown by § 43. See also not. in v. *Osi.* Yet Tacitus calls them *Germanorum natio*, on the strength of their geographical position only. This should caution us against considering his term *Germania* to be more ethnological than it really is. In the case of the *Osi*, we have a qualifying statement; and it was required—since, without it, we should have considered both them and the Aravisci Germans. But, as it is far from certain that such qualifying statements are given in *all* cases, without exception, we must remember the possibility of certain *non-Germanic* populations being called *Germani*, just as the Osi are here; whilst the *data* for correcting the natural inference from such a passage, are non-existent.

[6] *Aravisci—ab Osis, Osi ab Araviscis.*]—This involves the question of the relationship between the two.

By admitting the omission of an initial guttural (*ch* or *hh*), a change justified by the form *A*ttuarii as opposed to *Ch*attuarii, and by considering the *-isc* to represent a Slavonic compound sibilant (*itsh* or *ishtsh*) we get at some such form as *Kharavatsh*; a form which may fairly be supposed to be no unlikely name for that important branch of the Slavonic nation which appears in Herodotus as *Krobyz-i*, at the present time, as *Croatians*.

As early as the tenth century the name appears in the more unexceptionable form *Khorvat-i* (Nestor), in Greek Χρωϐάτοι (Constant. Porphyrog.) Χορϐάτοι (Cedrenus).

That the undoubted Croatian area was discontinuous, or, at least, that the population fell, like that of the Osi and Aravisci, into two divisions, is inferred from two expressions. One of these is *altera*, *e.g.*, in Cosmas of Prague (A.D. 1086) in the following notice: "Ad aquilonalem hi sunt termini: Psouane, *Ghrouati*, et *altera Chrouatia*, Zlasane, Trebouane, Bobarane." The other epithet is more important. Nestor calls his Croatians *Khorvati bjelii=white Croatians*. The Turks *translated* this epithet by *aspar*.

Ὅτι οἱ Χρωϐάτοι οἱ εἰς τὰ Δελματίας νῦν κατοικοῦντες μέρη, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀϐαπτίστων Χρωϐάτων καὶ τῶν Ἄσπρων ἐπονομαζομένων κατάγονται· οἵτινες Τουρκίας μὲν ἐκεῖθεν, Φραγγίας δὲ πλησίον κατοικοῦσι, καὶ συνοροῦσι Σκλάϐοις τοῖς ἀϐαπτίστοις Σέρϐλοις· τὸ δὲ Χρωϐάτοι τῇ τῶν Σκλάϐων διαλέκτῳ ἑρμηνεύεται, τουτέστι, οἱ τὴν πολλὴν χώραν κατέχοντες.—Const. Porphyrog. De Admin. Imp. c. 31, ed. Par. p. 97. Οἱ δὲ Χρωϐάτοι κατῴκουν τηνικαῦτα ἐκεῖθεν Βαγιϐαρείας, ἔνθα εἰσὶν ἀρτίως Βελοχρωϐάτοι, μία δὲ γενεὰ διαχωρισθεῖσα ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἤγουν ἀδελφοὶ πέντε, ὅ, τε Κλουκὰς καὶ ὁ Λόϐελος καὶ ὁ Κοσέντζης καὶ ὁ Μουχλὼ* καὶ ὁ Χρώϐατος, καὶ ἀδελφαὶ δύο, ἡ Τοῦγα καὶ ἡ Βοῦγα, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῶν ἦλθον εἰς Δελματίαν. . . οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ Χρωϐάτοι ἔμειναν πρὸς Φραγγίαν καὶ λέγονται ἀρτίως, Βελοχρωϐάτοι, ἤγουν Ἄσπροι Χρωϐάτοι, ἔχοντες τὸν ἴδιον ἄρχοντα· ὑπόκειντα δε Ὤτῳ τῷ Μεγάλῳ ῥηγὶ Φραγγίας τῆς καὶ Σαξίας, καὶ ἀϐάπτιστοι τυγχάνουσι, συμπενθερίας μετὰ τοὺς Τούρκους καὶ ἀγάπας ἔχοντες.—C. 30, ed. Par. p. 95. Ὅτι ἡ μεγάλη Χρωϐατία καὶ ἡ Ἄσπρη ἐπονομαζομένη ἀϐάπτιστος τυγχάνει μέχρι τοῦ σήμερον, καθὼς καὶ οἱ πλησιάζοντες αὐτὴν Σέρϐλοι· ὀλιγότερον καϐαλλαρικὸν ἐκϐάλλουσιν ὁμοίως καὶ πεζικὸν

* Probably, the *eponymi* of the *Lygii* and *Mugilones*.

παρὰ τὴν βαπτισμένην Χρωβατίαν, ὡς συνεχέστερον πραιδευόμενοι παρά τε τῶν Φράγγων, καὶ Τούρκων, καὶ Πατζινακιτῶν. Ἀλλ' οὔτε σαγήνας κέκτηνται, οὔτε κονδούρας, οὔτε ἐμπορευτικὰ πλοῖα, ὡς μήκοθεν οὔσης τῆς θαλάσσης· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἐκεῖσε μέχρι τῆς θαλάσσης ὁδός ἐστιν ἡμερῶν λ'· ἡ δὲ θάλασσα, εἰς ἣν διὰ τῶν ἡμερῶν λ' κατέρχονται, ἐστὶν ἡ λεγομένη Σκοτεινή.—C. 31, ed. Paris, p. 99 ; 13, p. 63. Οἱ δὲ Χρωβάτοι πρὸς τὰ ὄρη τοῖς Τούρκοις παράκεινται. Ἰστέον ὅτι οἱ Σέρβλοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀβαπτίστων Σέρβλων, τῶν καὶ Ἄσπρων ἐπονομαζομένων, κατάγονται, τῶν τῆς Τουρκίας ἐκεῖθεν κατοικούντων εἰς τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς Βοΐκι τόπον ἐπονομαζόμενον, ἐν οἷς πλησιάζει καὶ ἡ Φραγγία, ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ μεγάλη Χρωβατία ἡ ἀβάπτιστος, ἡ καὶ Ἄσπρη προσαγορευομένη· ἐκεῖσε οὖν καὶ οὗτοί οἱ Σέρβλοι τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κατῴκουν.—C. xxxii. p. 99.

Now what if this division of the Croatians be as old as the time of Tacitus? and what if the Germans *translated* the name in early times, even as the Turks did afterwards? In this case the name *Osi* represents the German *Weiss* = *White*, and the *Osi* are the *White Croatians* under their German name, and *Wis*-berg (Οὐϊσβούργιοι of Ptolemy) is *White*-hill (*or town*), and even the mysterious *Ask-iburgius Mons* is *Weiss-berg*.

No objections against this lie in the current notion that the Slavonians of the Danube did not make their appearance in history till the sixth century—the notion itself being not only objectionable, but almost certainly incorrect. All that we fairly get from the evidence of Procopius and others is, that it was the sixth century when the populations of the Lower Danube became known as *Slavonians*; just as it was the third when the Westphalian and Hanoverian Germans became known as *Saxons*, or those of the Lower Rhine as *Franks*, and just as three populations out of four throughout the world are known at different periods of their history by different names. The reasonable suggestion of Zeuss that the Aravisci are the population of the Raab, is a real complication. So is the name of the river *Cusus* in the probable territory of the *Osi*.

The complement to this note is not. in v. *Osi* in the sequel.

That *Os* = *Weis* is, perhaps, *by itself*, unlikely.

That *Aravisc* = *Hharavitsh* is also, perhaps, *by itself*, unlikely.

But that a part of the *Aravisci* called *Osi*, should = *Weisse Hharavische* is *not* unlikely—the evidence being of the sort called *cumulative*, where two small probabilities make one great one.

[7] *Treviri.*]—The lower third of the Moselle may be taken as the area of the Treviri; extending (there or thereabouts) from Treves (*Augusta Trevirorum*) to Coblentz (*Confluentes*).

The chief nations with which they were conterminous on the side of Gaul were the Condrusi, Eburones, and Remi—all *Belgæ*.

The Treviri, like the Tencteri, were pre-eminently strong in cavalry.—Cæsar, Bell. Gall. ii. 24, v. 3.

They were also but slowly conquered.—"Treviri liberi antea," &c. —Plin. iv. 17.

The name *Treviri* is most probably Gallic. The *Tre-*, is the *Tre* in such words as *Tre-casses* in ancient Gaul, and *Tregonell* in Cornwall; the Keltic *tre=place*, a root exceedingly common in Keltic geographical terms. The constitution was *Gallic*, the Condrusi and Eburones being *clientes* of the *Treviri*.

The language of the *Tre-viri* is important.

In most cases it would be hypercritical to suppose that there was any difference between the language of the town of *Treves* and the language of the *Treviri*. In the present question, however, it is not so. The area under consideration is the area of either a mixed population, or the area of mixed ethnological characteristics—at least, such is the language of both Cæsar and Tacitus. Hence, the dialect of the country and the dialect of the town may differ. All, then, that can be said is, that a statement as to the language of the town of Treves *probably* applies to that of the Treviri, and *vice versâ* —probably, but not certainly.

Now St. Jerome has the following passage (Prolegomen. lib. ii. ad Epist. ad Galat.)—"Unum est quod inferimus et promissum in exordio reddimus, *Galatas* excepto sermone Græco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur, propriam linguam eandem pene habere quam *Treviri*, nec referre si aliqua exinde corruperint; quum et Afri Phœnicum linguam nonnulla ex parte mutaverint; et ipsa Latinitas et regionibus quotidie mutetur et tempore."

I think that this language was that of the *Tolistoboii*, *Trocmi*, and *Tectosagæ*, *i.e.*, of those *Galatæ* who gave their name to *Galatia*.

Niebuhr, however, denies that it was Galatian that St. Jerome heard; and, after noticing the campaign of the Romans against them, he adds in a note that "St. Jerome says that he heard the same language in Phrygia as at Treves; but this cannot be referred to the Galatians, and St. Jerome probably saw Germans who had settled in Phrygia at different times, especially Goths, in the

reign of Theodosius. It may be looked upon as an established fact that *Treves was German*, and it is not likely that the Gallic language maintained itself in Asia down to so late a period." Why not? What are the very conclusive reasons which make *Treves* so German? This is considered in the sequel.*

8 *Nervii.*]—Belgians of the valley of the Sambre (*Sabis*) and the bravest Gauls of Gallia. Their opposition was the most obstinate Cæsar met with; and their extermination *almost*, but not *wholly*, complete.

Strabo makes them conterminous with the Treviri; and, considered politically, they probably were so. The smaller populations, who stood in the relation of clients to either one or the other of these two great nations, probably filled up the whole tract from the sea, between Dunkirk and Ostend, to the Rhine about Coblentz.

North-east of the Nervii lay the Aduatici; a people not mentioned by Tacitus, nor, indeed, by any writer but Cæsar, who considered them the descendants of the Teutones and Cimbri.

Now Appian applies what Cæsar says of the Aduatici to the Nervii, ἦσαν δὲ (Νέρβιοι) τῶν Κίμβρων καὶ Τευτόνων ἀπόγονοι.

It is not difficult to conceive how such victories as that of Arminius and other Germans being known to the Gauls, the name of German might become a matter of pride along the whole Belgic frontier, especially if there were an intermixture of German blood as well. This might take place even while the language, the constitution, and the religion remained Gallic.

9 *Vangiones.*]—Their locality was the parts about Worms—*Borbetomagus*, afterwards *Wormatia;* to which Ammianus uses *Civitas Vangionum* as a synonym.

The Vangiones are mentioned by Cæsar as forming part of the army of Ariovistus.

10 *Triboci.*]—In the parts about Strasbourg.

The name seems Keltic; *Tre-* being a Keltic prefix.

The *Tri*-boci are mentioned by Cæsar as forming part of the army of Ariovistus.

11 *Nemetes.*]—Their locality was the parts about Spiers, originally *Novio-magus.*

* See *Epilegomena*, § *The Quasi-Germanic Gauls.*

The Nemetes are mentioned by Cæsar as forming part of the army of Ariovistus.

The words *haud dubiè* applied to *these* three nations show that, in the mind of Tacitus, at least, they were not exactly in the same category. The evidence of their Germanic character was stronger in the one case than in the other. However clear the case might be with the Treviri and Nervii, it was clearer with the Vangiones, Nemetes, and Triboci.

[12] *Ubii.*]—In the time of Cæsar, the Ubii were bounded by the Rhine, the country of the Suevi, and the country of the Sigambri. These two last lines of demarcation are indefinite.

They belonged, however, *then* to the German side of the Rhine; " Ubii, qui proximi accolunt, Rhenum attingunt."

They were encroached on by their neighbours, and had consequently lost, rather than gained, power.

They once constituted a *civitas*, " civitas ampla atque florens."—Cæsar.

Agrippa, in the reign of Augustus, transplanted them to form the *Colonia Agrippinensis* = *Cologne*, Περὰν δὲ ᾤκουν κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τόπον Οὔβιοι, οὓς μετήγαγεν Ἄγριππας ἑκόντας εἰς τὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ Ῥήνου.—Strabo, iv. p. 194.

The complement to the last six notes is *Epilegomena*, § *The Quasi-Germanic Gauls.*

XXIX. Omnium harum gentium virtute præcipui Batavi,[1] non multùm ex ripâ, sed insulam Rheni amnis colunt, Chattorum quondam populus, et seditione domesticâ in eas sedes transgressus, in quibus pars Romani imperii fierent. Manet honos, et antiquæ societatis insigne: nam nec tributis contemnuntur, nec publicanus atterit: exempti oneribus et collationibus, et tantùm in usum prœliorum sepositi, velut tela atque arma, bellis reservantur. Est in eodem obsequio et Mattiacorum[2] gens. Protulit enim magnitudo populi Romani ultra Rhenum, ultraque veteres terminos, imperii reverentiam. Ita sede finibusque in suâ ripâ,

mente animoque nobiscum agunt, cetera similes Batavis, nisi quòd ipso adhuc terræ suæ solo et cœlo acriùs animantur. Non numeraverim inter Germaniæ populos, quamquam trans Rhenum Danubiumque consederint, eos, qui Decumates agros[3] exercent. Levissimus quisque Gallorum, et inopiâ audax, dubiæ possessionis solum occupavere. Mox limite acto,[4] promotisque præsidiis, sinus imperii, et pars provinciæ habentur.

NOTES ON SECTION XXIX.

[1] *Batavi.*]—Cæsar places the Batavi in the island formed by the Maas, Vhaal, and Rhine, "Mosa, parte quadam ex Rheno recepta, quæ appellatur Vahalis, insulam efficit Batavorum."—Bell. Gall. iv. 10.

The *Over-Betuwe* and *Neder-Betuwe* still preserve the name. Probably, they also fix the locality.

This is considerably distant from *Hesse*, the centre of the Chatti. Nevertheless, the origin ascribed to the Batavi by Tacitus must be taken as we find it.

Upon the principle of considering all migrations along a navigable water-course, where the population of the intermediate parts differs from that of the extremities, as *fluviatile*, I consider that the *Batavi* came from the country of the *Chatti* in boats. Still, Hesse is on the Weser rather than on the Rhine.

Hitherto there are but few complications.

A slight difficulty arises from certain passages in Dion. He speaks of the merits and numbers of the Batavian *cavalry*. This is not what we expect from the occupants of a small island.

A greater arises when we try to reconcile the statement of Tacitus with the present state of the Dutch language. The Dutch of Holland is a Platt-Deutsch dialect, nowhere more so than in Over and Neder Betuwe.

The language of the Hessians (or modern Chatti) is High German.

Again—the name *Batavi* extended farther than the *insula* (*insulæ*) *Batavorum*, at least as early as the time of Ptolemy; since that writer mentions *Leyden*=Λουγόδεινον Βαταδῶν. Now Λουγόδεινον (*Lug-dunum*) is not only Keltic in respect to its termination *-dunum*, but was also the name of the unequivocally Gallic town Lyons (*Lug-dunum*).

Lastly—although we can, by considering the Batavian Chatti to have been an inconsiderable and intrusive population, get over the difficulty arising out of the High-German dialect of the Chatti, and the Platt-Deutsch of the present people of Holland, we are not at liberty to do so. According to Tacitus, the Batavi were so far from standing alone, that the *Caninefates* were in the same category, —" Caninefates, ... ea gens partem insulæ colit, origine, linguâ, virtute par Batavis, numero superantur."—Hist. iv. 15.

For a further notice of the Batavi, see *Epilegomena*, § *Batti* and *Subatti*.

[2] *Mattiacorum.*]—The mention of the warm baths of the *Mattiaci*— " Mattiaci in Germania *fontes calidi* trans Rhenum " (Pliny, xxxi. 2), —fixes them in the neighbourhood of Wisbaden. This is Zeuss's inference; and there seems no good reason for refining on it. The fact of a mixed army of *Chatti*, *Usipii*, and *Mattiaci*, besieging Mayence confirms this view. " Maguntiaci obsessores mixtus ex Chattis, Usipiis, Mattiacis exercitus."—Tac. Hist. iv. 37.—Zeuss, p. 99.

[3] *Decumates agros.*]—The *Decumates agri* were, in the time of Cæsar, a *debatable land* between the Gauls and the Germans. By the time of Tacitus it had been appropriated by Rome.

Niebuhr expressly states that, in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, Suabia was not yet subject to Rome; his reason being that no mention is made of any attacks upon Germany south of the Lahn. Although this view rests upon negative evidence, and is qualified by the statement that all that is known about this war is vague and indefinite, the *a priori* probabilities are in favour of it, and it would be hypercritical to refine upon it.

Domitian's actions in Germany are, probably, undervalued. Niebuhr mentions his war with the Chatti about the Maine. He also admits the evidence of medals as to the title of *Germanicus* borne by Domitian; but he demurs to the evidence of Martial as to its being deserved; adding that " the historians are unanimous that those victories were not realities, though they cannot be wholly fictitious." In the subsequent lecture, he supplies the additional statement that the " *Aræ Flaviæ*, the name of a place on the military road from the Maine to Augsburg, proves that, probably under Domitian, the Romans had already taken possession of that *sinus imperii.*" He adds, in a note, that Frontinus (Strateg. i. 3, 10) expressly

ascribes the construction of the *limes Romanus* to Domitian. Why then use such epithets as *probably?* Nine-tenths of the admitted facts in history, is less supported by evidence than the reduction of the Decumates agri, anterior to the reign of Nerva. This is a point to which even the present passage bears testimony.

Under Nerva there was a "little war in Suabia, the only trace of which exists in an inscription, in which mention is made of a *victoria Suevica*." This was in 97 or 89, A.D.—Niebuhr's Lectures.

Under Trajan and Adrian, the relations between Rome and Germany were peaceful.—Ditto.

In the reign of Antoninus Pius "we hear of a defensive war against the Chatti."—Ditto.

The great Marcomannic war characterized the reign of Aurelius Antoninus. In this, the tribes on the Decumatian frontier took some, but not the main, part. This was chiefly in the hands of the Germans of the Slavonic Marches—the agri Decumates being a Gallic or Romano-Gallic one.

Commodus purchased an absence from hostilities, and Severus, probably, overawed them. At any rate, we hear nothing of German wars in his reign.

One of the titles of Caracalla presents us, for the first time, with the important epithet *Alemannicus*. How it was earned we learn from the following extract—"Antoninus, Caracalla dictus . . . . *Alemannos*, gentem populosum, ex equo mirifice pugnantem, prope Mænum amnem devicit."—Aur. Victor, de Cæs. c. 21.

This is the first time the important name *Alemanni* occurs, and for that reason the notice of the agri Decumates has been brought down thus low (A.D. 215); since the agri Decumates, and the parts to the north and east of them, form the great Alemannic area.

Further notice of these Germans will be found in *Epilegomena*, § *Alemanni*.

In saying that "in the time of Tacitus the agri Decumates had been appropriated by Rome," I mean not that it was settled, or organized, but that it was kept as a *March* or *military frontier*. A debatable land of this kind is the Suevic Waste, as described by Cæsar. I believe that at the present moment a portion of the Austrian and Ottoman frontier is in this condition,—*viz.*, Turkish Croatia, between Austrian Croatia, Herzegovina, Bosnia, and Slavonia.

Politically, the *Decumates agri* coincide with the modern Duchy of

Baden, three-fourths of Wurtemburg, Hohenzollern, and a small corner of Bavaria.

Physically, they form the district of the Black Forest and the Rauhe Alpe, and consist of a table-land, containing the head-waters of the Neckar.

[4] *Limite acto.*]—Was this *limes* a ditch, wall, or rampart, or was it a physical boundary; in other words, does *limes* mean an artificial or a natural line of demarcation? The reference to Frontinus in the previous note *partially* answers this. The *limes* was an *artificial* boundary.

Between the bend of the Neckar and the upper part of the river Altmuhl, in the neighbourhood of Ohringen, are the remains of a fortified ditch. On the Upper Altmuhl they can be traced afresh; and they re-appear on the Danube, between Pforing and Kelheim. Part or the whole of this is called the *Teufelsmauer*, or *Devil's Wall.* The inference that it is of Roman origin is unexceptionable. The exact line, however, has not, I believe, been worked out. Neither has its connection or *non*-connection with the *Pfahl-Graben.*

The *Pfahl-Graben* is a similar line, running at nearly right angles with the river Lahn, between Giessen and Ortenburg.

For practical purposes, a rough conventional line will do as well as a real one. This may be drawn so as to make the *limes* run from the Maine to Kelheim, *i.e.*, from the junction of the Maine and Rhine, to the junction of the Altmuhl and Danube. This gives to the Romans rather more than Zeuss, and rather less than Niebuhr allows them.

XXX. Ultra hos Chatti[1] initium sedis ab Hercynio saltu[2] inchoant, non ita effusis ac palustribus locis, ut ceteræ civitates, in quas Germania patescit: durant siquidem colles, paullatimque rarescunt: et Chattos suos saltus Hercynius prosequitur simul atque deponit. Duriora genti corpora, stricti artus, minax vultus, et major animi vigor. Multum (ut inter Germanos) rationis ac solertiæ: præponere electos, audire præpositos, nosse ordines, intelligere occasiones, dif-

ferre impetus, disponere diem, vallare noctem, fortunam inter dubia, virtutem inter certa numerare: quodque rarissimum, nec nisi ratione disciplinæ concessum, plus reponere in duce, quàm in exercitu. Omne robur in pedite, quem super arma ferramentis quoque et copiis onerant. Alios ad prœlium ire videas, Chattos ad bellum: rari excursus et fortuita pugna. Equestrium sanè virium id proprium, citò parare victoriam, citò cedere. Velocitas juxta formidinem, cunctatio propior constantiæ est.

NOTES ON SECTION XXX.

[1] *Chatti.*]—The two chief ethnological facts connected with this name are:—

1. That *Chatti* and *Hesse* are one and the same word.
2. That the *Chatti* of Tacitus are the *Suevi* of Cæsar.

The propriety of spelling the word with an *-h-*, and of writing *Chatti* rather than *Catti*, is indicated by the Greek forms, Χάττοι, and Χάτται, Κάττοι or Κάτται being nowhere found, though in some of the newer and more inferior MSS. of Pliny and Tacitus *Catti* is the reading.

Just as the *ch* in *Chauci* becomes in German the *h* in *Hocing*, so does the *ch* in Chatti become the *h* in *Hesse.*

The change from *t* to *s* is the same that occurs in the *High* German form *wasser* as opposed to the *Low* German *water*.

All this is a matter which has been generally received by those who first worked it out, *viz.*, the German philologists, Zeuss, Grimm, and others. Whether, however, the real nature of the change has been explained, or rather whether any change at all has taken place, is uncertain. As far as I can ascertain the views of the writers in question, their opinion seems to be that those Hessians of Hesse who coincided with the ancient Chatti, called *themselves* by that name (*Chatti*). If so, the old form has changed into the new one, and the word which was now *Hesse* was once *Chatti*, the change having taken place on Hessian ground, and under the influence of time alone.

This is not the view which the present writer adopts. He sees no grounds for believing that the Hessians ever used, as their own

designation, any other form than the one in *h-* and *s-*. Hence to say that *Hesse* came from *Chatti* is like saying that *wasser* came from *water;* the truth being that the one was the *High,* the other the *Low* German form.

Admitting this, we gain something more than a barren fact. We infer that, in the particular case of the Chatti, at least, the authorities of Tacitus were *Low* Germans; a view confirmed not only by the *a priori* probabilities of the case, but by several other similar points of *internal* evidence.

That the Chatti of Tacitus are the Suevi of Cæsar, is grounded upon the—

a. Absence of the name *Chatti* in the *Bellum Gallicum:* though they were the people most immediately in contact with Gaul.

b. The history of the war with Ariovistus.

c. The magnitude of the two populations; each requiring too large an area to be in juxtaposition with one another within the assignable limits.

d. The absence of the evidence of any considerable movements in the way of conquest or migration between the times of Cæsar and Strabo, this latter writer mentioning the Chatti.

Grimm, who, as a Hessian, has entered upon the minute ethnology of his native country *con amore,* has added to these reasons, and found confirmations of their identity in the local legends of Hesse. No reader acquainted with the vitality of old bye-words, and with the metamorphoses of popular stories, will think the following points of evidence unworthy of record.

a. Let the word *Chatti,* originally Low German, but now Roman, give rise to a nickname (*Schimpf*-wort), applicable to the Hessians. Let them be called *dogs* or *whelps,* according to the translation of the root of *cat-ul-us.* Let such a name apply to both the Hessians and the Suabians. As far as this goes, it goes towards the connection of the two by means of the common name *Catti.*

Now a nickname (*Schimpfwort*) of the Hessians is *Hund-Hessen* or *Dog Hessians* (*Hound Hessians*): and a nickname (*Schimpfwort*) of the Suabians is *blinde Schwab*=or *blind Suabian*—even as puppies are blind at birth.

Everything in ethnology is a conflict of difficulties; and it must not be concealed that a grave objection lies against the identification of the Chatti and Suevi, in the fact that with the ancient writers subsequent to Cæsar, there is a mention of the *Suevi*

as well as the *Chatti*, and in modern geography, there is a *Suabia* as well as a *Hesse*.

I believe that the difficulty is diminished by the § on the *Suevi* in the *Epilegomena*.

To the question, why did Cæsar call the Catti Suevi? the answers are of two kinds.

1. It may be said that the name had changed in the interval; either by the preponderance of a different branch of the Confederation, or by some other means.

2. It may be said that the two names belonged to different languages, and that *Suev-* was the name by which the Chatti were known to Cæsar's informants, the Gauls; just as the *Kymry* are known to the English by the name of Welsh.

The latter view is the one adopted by the present writer. That *Suevi* was the Gallic name of the Germans of the Middle Rhine, I feel certain. Whether it was exclusively Gallic, *i.e.*, foreign to these same Germans themselves, will be considered in the § just referred to.

[2] *Hercynio saltu.*]—The language from whence the first notice of the Hercynian range (whether of mountains or woods) was taken, is probably the Keltic; at least no derivation is so probable as the one indicated by Zeuss—*erchynn*=*elevated*, *erchynedd*=*elevations*.

If so, the portion of the range to which it applied would be the western, rather than the eastern extremity; a matter of some importance, since the fact of its having been first used by Greeks would suggest the contrary notion. As it is, however, we must suppose that the term reached Aristotle or his informants just as the words *Alp*, *Kelt*, or *Gaul* (Γάλαται) did.

The Hercynian forest, as delineated by Cæsar, only partially follows the line of the Danube. There is, however, a tract in physical geography with which it coincides entirely. This is the system of highlands or mountains, which forms the northern boundary of the valley of the Danube. Hence, from west to east, the line of the southern limit of the tract in question runs from Baden (*Rauraci*), where the river-system is that of the Rhine, along the highlands of Wurtemburg (*Decumates agri*), Franconia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Upper Hungary. Here the bend to the left (north) takes place; in other words, we have the long flat valley of the Theiss (*Tibiscus*) intervening between the mountain-range and the

Danube, instead of the smaller and more elevated ones of the Naab (in Bavaria), the March (in Moravia), and the Waag and Gran (in Upper Hungary). After this, however, a second bend, not known to Cæsar, takes place, and the forest-range, after encircling Hungary, re-approaches the Danube in Transylvania.

Now the system of mountains which has taken us through the countries enumerated, is as follows:—The highlands of the Black Forest, the Rauhe Alpe (*Abnoba mons*), their continuation to the Fichtel-Gebirge, the Böhmerwald Gebirge (*Gabreta silva*), the Wilde Gebirge (*Hercynii montes*), the Yablunka Gebirge (*Luna silva*), the Carpathian mountains (*Askiburgius mons*), their southern offset to the Danube (*Sarmatici montes*). Here the turn occurs; and the forest follows the eastern direction of the Carpathians, which, after taking in the ancient maps the name of Alpes Bastarnicæ, approach the Danube, and divide Transylvania from Wallachia.

XXXI. Et aliis Germanorum populis usurpatum rarâ et privatâ cujusque audentiâ, apud Chattos in consensum vertit, ut primùm adoleverint, crinem barbamque summittere,[1] nec, nisi hoste cæso, exuere votivum obligatumque virtuti oris habitum. Super sanguinem et spolia, revelant frontem, seque "tum demum pretia nascendi retulisse, dignosque patriâ ac parentibus" ferunt. Ignavis et imbellibus manet squalor. Fortissimus quisque ferreum insuper anulum (ignominiosum id genti) velut vinculum gestat, donec se cæde hostis absolvat. Plurimis Chattorum hic placet habitus. Jamque canent insignes, et hostibus simul suisque monstrati: omnium penes hos initia pugnarum: hæc prima semper acies, visu nova. Nam ne in pace quidem vultu mitiore mansuescunt. Nulli domus, aut ager, aut aliqua cura: prout ad quemque venêre, aluntur: prodigi alieni, contemptores suî: donec exsanguis senectus tam duræ virtuti impares faciat.

NOTE ON SECTION XXXI.

[1] *Crinem barbamque summittere.*]—The whole evidence of antiquity is to the abundant locks of the Germans, and to their yellow hue. From the customs of some of the Frisian or Norse population, especially that of the supposed Norse settlements of Molquerum and Hindelopen in Friesland, as they appear in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is probably that this golden or flaxen hue was artificially heightened, *i.e.*, by alkaline washes of soda or potash ley. The likelihood of this must be borne in mind when we consider the extent to which the present preponderance of dark or brown hair amongst many Germanic populations is referable to a real change of colour; inasmuch as it possibly may be accounted for by the disuse of the habit of blanching it.

In all ethnological questions connected with the colour and texture of the hair, the customs of the country, in respect to the dressing of it, should be carefully attended to. Thus amongst the islanders of more than one part of the South Sea and Indian Ocean, where the hair is naturally jet-black, there is the practice of washing the head in ash, or lime-water—which gives it a red tinge. Hair, thus discoloured, has been described by excellent writers as being *red.*

The population wherein really, and naturally, red hair preponderates, is not German, but Ugrian; the Votiak, and other Finns of the Volga, being pre-eminently *πύῤῥοι*; and, I think it likely that when we hear of Germans being thus distinguished (*i.e.*, as *red* rather than *yellow*-haired), these alkaline washes may have had something to do with the epithet. Such are common. Silius Italicus calls the Batavian "*rufus* Batavus."—iii. 608. More express still is the following extract from Galen:—Οὕτως γοῦν τινὲς ὀνομάζουσι τοὺς Γερμανοὺς ξανθοὺς, καὶ τοί γε οὐκ ὄντας ξανθοὺς, ἐὰν ἀκριβῶς τὶς ἐθέλοι καλεῖν, ἀλλὰ πυῤῥούς.

That *long* hair was generally an honourable ornament, we infer from its being amongst the Franks a sign of being a freeman; whereas, to have the hair clipped, was a degrading punishment. At the same time, as this very passage implies, the German modes of wearing it were various. Herodian mentions the κουρὰ τῶν Γερμανῶν (iv. 7); and Seneca the *rufus crinis et coactus in nodum apud Germanos.*—De Ira, c. 26.

XXXII. Proximi Chattis certum jam alveo Rhenum, quique terminus esse sufficiat, Usipii[1] ac Tencteri[2] colunt. Tencteri super solitum bellorum decus equestris disciplinæ arte præcellunt. Nec major apud Chattos peditum laus, quàm Tencteris equitum. Sic instituêre majores, posteri imitantur. Hi lusus infantium, hæc juvenum æmulatio, perseverant senes: inter familiam, et penates, et jura successionum, equi traduntur: excipit filius, non, ut cetera, maximus natu, sed prout ferox bello et melior.

NOTES ON SECTION XXXII.

[1] *Usipii.*]—Another form of the word is *Usip-et-es.*

I quite agree with Zeuss in his suggestion, that this *-et*, is the Keltic sign of the plural, and that this is the reason why it occurs in Cæsar throughout, whilst in Tacitus, it is the prevalent reading only once (Ann. i. 51).

Cæsar's notice of the Usipii takes precedence of all others. He places them on the Lower Rhine, making them conterminous (or nearly so) with the Suevi, Sicambri, Tencteri, Ubii, and Bructeri.

The graver complications begin with the notice of Ptolemy. A population with a name so like *Usipii* as Οὐΐσποι, is placed by that writer as far south as the frontier of the Helvetian Desert—that is, we identify the two names. The necessity, however, for doing so is doubtful. The name is, probably, *Gallic.*

[2] *Tencteri.*]—The history of the Tencteri is nearly that of the Usipii, and *vice versâ.*

Pressed by the Suevi (*Chatti*) they crossed the Rhine; were defeated by Cæsar near the junction of the Maas; and escaped, as a remnant, by retracing their steps, and re-passing the Rhine to the country of the Sigambri. A line drawn due east of Cologne, would pass through the *original* country of the Ubii, Tencteri, and Usipii. They were Germans (*i.e.*, of the High German, or of the Platt-Deutsch division) rather than Saxons or Frisians.

According to Dion and Florus, Drusus conquered the Tencteri and Usipii on his way to the Chatti; the latter being on the northern bank of the river Lippe. The complement to these two notes is to be found in the *Epilegomena,* § *Vispi.*

XXXIII. Juxta Tencteros Bructeri[1] olim occurrebant: nunc Chamavos[2] et Angrivarios[3] immigrasse narratur, pulsis Bructeris ac penitus excisis, vicinarum consensu nationum, seu superbiæ odio, seu prædæ dulcedine, seu favore quodam erga nos deorum: nam ne spectaculo quidem prœlii invidêre; super LX. millia, non armis telisque Romanis, sed, quod magnificentius est, oblectationi oculisque ceciderunt. Maneat quæso, duretque gentibus, si non amor nostrî, at certè odium suî: quando, urgentibus imperii fatis, nihil jam præstare fortuna majus potest, quàm hostium discordiam.

NOTES ON SECTION XXXIII.

[1] *Bructeri.*]—Probable German forms of this word would be, in Anglo-Saxon *Breochtware*, in Old Saxon *Briuchtuuari*, in Frisian *Brjuchtwara.*

My reason for believing that the syllable *-eri*, represents the second element in a compound word, and that that word was *-ware=inhabitants* (as in *Cantware=inhabitants of Kent*) lies in the following extract from Beda—"Sunt autem Fresones, Rugini, Dani, Huni, antiqui Saxones, *Boructuarii*, sunt etiam alii perplures iisdem in partibus populi, paganis adhuc ritibus servientes."—Hist. Ecclesiast. v. 10. The same writer repeats the name more than once.

Perhaps the same may have been the case with the form *Tencteri=Tenctware.* Be this as it may, notwithstanding the contraction, the *e* in *Bructĕri* is short. It is written with ε in Greek (Βρούκτεροι), whilst in Latin we have the following lines of Sidonius Apollinaris—

——————— Toringus
Bructerus, ulvosa vel quem Nicer alluit unda
Prorumpit Francus. —Carm. vii. 324.

The utter excision (*penitus excisis*) of the Bructeri, is an overstatement. Neither was their expulsion complete; on the contrary, it was very partial. This we learn from the subsequent notices of the Bructeri, who are so far from being exterminated that they are mentioned more than most other German tribes.

Ptolemy divides them into the *Bructeri Majores*, and *Bructeri minores* (Βουσακτέροι μείζονες and Βουσακτέροι ἐλάττονες or μικροί); the Ems dividing them.

In Nazarius' panegyric to Constantine, in the beginning of the fourth century, they are mentioned along with the Chamavi and Cherusci, as nations whom it was glorious to have conquered.

Lastly, in the ninth and tenth centuries, we meet notices of the *pagus Borahtra*—*pagus Bortergo*—*pagus Borotra*—*pagus Boractron*, and *pagus Boratre*, all meaning the same locality.

The following passage fixes it still closer—"Bruno magnus satrapa Saxonum cum nobili comitatu in provincia *Boructuariorum* pernoctans *in vico Ratingen* ..; in quadam *Boructuariorum villa Velsenberg* nomine."—Vita S. Swiberti ap. Leibn. i. 20, 21.

A line drawn from Munster to Cologne would pass through part of the country of the Bructeri; a country of which the outline seems to have been very irregular.

They are on the confines of the Frisian, Old Saxon, and Platt-Deutsch areas, and it is difficult to say to which they belonged. I think the Old-Saxon places in -*um* (if such there be) occur within their area.

[2] *Chamavos.*]—Ptolemy's form is Χαῖμαι.

The present town of Ham, in Westphalia, probably preserves the name and fixes the *original* locality of the Chamavi.

But either the name or the people spread as far as the Rhine and Ysel; and the Chamavian and Salian Franks become mentioned together. That the extension was *real*—*i.e.*, that of the people, and not merely of the import of the name—is probable. They have already encroached on the Bruct-eri.

In the *Tabula Peutingeriana* we find CHAMAVI QUI ELPRANCI. Zeuss, reasonably, considers this to mean ET PHRANCI.

A tract of land, at the present day, extending down the Ysel to the neighbourhood of Deventer, is called *Hame-land*; and it is mentioned in early documents as "pagus Saxoniæ *Hamalant*—in Sutfeno (South Fen=Zutphen) in pago *Hameland*—in Duisburg in pago *Hameland*—in Dauindre (Deventer) in eodem pago *Hameland*—abbatiam Altene juxta Rhenum flumen in pago *Hamaland*."

This implies a great displacement of Bructeri.

It had taken place before the reign of the Emperor Julian.—Χαμάβων γὰρ μὴ βουλομένων ἀδύνατόν ἐστι τὴν τῆς Βρεταννικῆς νήσου

σιτοπομπίαν ἐπὶ τὰ Ῥωμαϊκὰ φρούρια διαπέμπεσθαι.—Ὑπεδεξάμην μὲν μοῖραν τοῦ Σαλίων ἔθνους, Χαμάβους δὲ ἐξήλασα.—Eunap. in Exc. Leg.

Ausonius makes the middle syllable long :

> Accedent vires, quas Francia, quasque *Chamaves*
> Germanique tremunt.—Mosella, 434.

The branch of the Germanic population to which the original Chamavi belonged, was almost certainly the Old Saxon.

Amongst the obscurest of the traditionary heroes of the Westphalian and Hanoverian Germans is *Ham*, whose Latinized name is *Ammius*. This Ammius may, or may not, have been the *eponymus* of the *Cham*-avi.

A shade is thrown over the common origin of the different Chamavi by the possibility of *cham-* being a geographical term; in which case it might apply to different populations, irrespective of ethnological identity.

Ptolemy has, in the parts between the Danube and Thuringia, not only a population called Παρμαι-κάμποι, but one called Ἀδραβαι-κάμποι also—a sure sign of the words being compound.

Now Zeuss tells us that he finds—and from the context his remark either applies, or should apply, to this locality—in old documents not only a place called *Cham*, but *Marcha Chambe.**—p. 121.

Add to this the root *Ham-* in *Ham*-burg. For the *Chamavi* as colonists, see *Epilegomena*, § *Chattuarii.*

[3] *Angrivarios.*]—This is a compound name; the latter elements being the *ware* in Cantware=*occupants, inhabitants.*

The present town of *Engern*, near Herford, in Westphalia, the supposed scene of Varus's defeat, probably preserves the name, and fixes the locality of the *Angri-varii*. But the area was a wide one.

That this identity is not taken up on light grounds is shown by the following extracts.

> Generalis habet populos divisio ternos,
> Insignita quibus Saxonia floruit olim;
> Nomina nunc remanent, virtus antiqua recessit.
> Denique *Westfalos* vocitant in parte manentes
> Occidua, quorum non longe terminus amne
> A Rheno distat : regionem solis ad ortum
> Inhabitant *Osterliudi*, quos nomine quidam

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Parmæcampi.*

Ostvalos alio vocitant, confinia quorum
Infestant conjuncta suis gens perfida Sclavi.*
Inter prædictos media regione morantur
Angarii, populus Saxonum tertius; horum
Patria Francorum terris sociatur ab austro,
Oceanoque eadem conjungitur ex aquilone.
Poeta Saxo ad an. 772.

The Ang-*arii* separated the *East-* and *West-phalias*.

Or, the *Oster-liudi* from the *Wester-liudi*.

Or, the *East-Saxons* from the *West-Saxons*, a German *E-ssex* from a German *We-ssex;* the *Angrarii* being, in reality, a German *Middle-sex*.

"Rex amne (Wisura) trajecto cum parte exercitus ad Ovacrum fluvium contendit, ubi ei Hessi, unus e primoribus Saxonum cum omnibus *Ostfalais* occurrens, et obsides, quos rex imperaverat, dedit et sacramentum fidelitatis juravit. Inde regresso, cum in pagum qui Bucki vocatur pervenisset, *Angrarii* cum suis primoribus occurrerunt, et sicut *Ostfalai*, juxta quod imperaverat, obsides ac sacramenta dederunt . . . Tum demum *Westfalaorum* obsidibus acceptis, ad hiemandum in Francia revertitur."—Annal. Einhardi ad an. 775, Pertz i. 155. "Tunc domnus Carolus . . . perrexit usque Obacrum fluvium. Ibi omnes *Austreleudi* Saxones venientes cum Hassione, et dederunt obsides . . . venerunt *Angrarii* (al. *Angarii*) in pago qui dicitur Bucki una cum Brunone et reliquis optimatibus eorum et dederunt ibi obsides, sicut *Austrasii* . . . Stragem ex eis fecit, et prædam multam conquisivit super *Westfalaos*, et obsides dederunt, sicut et alii Saxones."—Annal. Lauriss. ad an. 775, Pertz i. 144.

The following forms approach the supposed modern equivalent (*Engern*) closely; "*Angeri* in orientali regione—*Angaria* occidentalis—*Angari* in pago Logni—*Angeri* in occidentali regione—*Angariâ* occidentali in pago Nithega—*Angari* in pago Leri." They also prove the magnitude of the area.

They also verify the origin of the form Bruct-*eri* out of the more manifest compound Bruct-*ware;* as well as the supposed origin of Tenct-*eri* out of Tenct-*ware*.

The identity of the Angrivarian locality with Engern being a point upon which much turns, these details have been given in full.

---

* Observe the early notice of the Western Slavonians.

XXXIV. Angrivarios et Chamavos a tergo[1] Dulgibini[2] et Chasuari[3] cludunt, aliæque gentes haud perinde memoratæ. A fronte Frisii[4] excipiunt. "Majoribus minoribusque[5] Frisiis" vocabulum est, ex modo virium: utræque nationes usque ad Oceanum Rheno prætexuntur, ambiuntque immensos insuper lacus, et Romanis classibus navigatos. Ipsum quinetiam Oceanum illà tentavimus: et superesse adhuc Herculis columnas fama vulgavit: sive adiit Hercules, seu quidquid ubique magnificum est, in claritatem ejus referre consensimus. Nec defuit audentia Druso Germanico: sed obstitit Oceanus in se simul atque in Herculem inquiri. Mox nemo tentavit: sanctiusque ac reverentius visum, de actis deorum credere, quàm scire.

NOTES ON SECTION XXXIV.

[1] *A tergo Dulgibini et Chasuari.*]—This must mean *north* (and, perhaps, a little north-*west*) rather than due east or north.

A fronte Frisii.—This must mean west (or north-west); and to do this there must be a considerable irregularity and extension of frontier on either one side or the other. This is rather forcing the text.

At the same time it is all that is required; and when we consider that by allowing this we get—

a. The *Angri*-varii in *Engern,*

b. The *Cham*-avi in *Hamm,*

c. The *Dulg*-ubini in *Dulm*-en; and—

d. The *Chas*-uari on the *Hase,* it cannot well be considered too much.

[2] *Dulgibini.*—In Ptolemy, Δουλγούμνιοι. The word is, probably, a compound; although no satisfactory explanation of its elements has been given. Zeuss suggests that the *dulg-*=the Icelandic *dolgr*=*enemy, dolg*=*struggle,* Anglo-Saxon *dolg,* Old High German *tolc;* whilst the *gibin* is from the same root as the *guber-* in *Guber-ni*=*gambar*=*bold,* the *m* being lost in the same way that the *n* of *standan* is lost in *studan.*

In respect to their locality, Ptolemy places them next to the Λακκοβάρδοι.

My own belief is that their name is preserved, and their locality fixed by the present Westphalian town called *Dulmen*—a form sufficiently near Ptolemy's Δουλγούμνιοι to be admitted.

[3] *Chasuari.*]—Like *Angri-varii* a compound name, and, probably, that of the occupants of the banks of the river Hase, especially the parts about *Hase-lunde.*

Now there is another name so near that of the *Chas-uari* that, although not mentioned by Tacitus, it requires notice. It is that of the *Chatt-uarii.*

The *German* form of this (a real and known form) was *Hæt-ware* =*occupants of the country of Chatti.*

Strabo and Paterculus alone mention this people — Strabo as Χαττου-άριοι, Paterculus as *Attu-arii.*

For a fuller notice of this question, and for the *Att*-uarian colonies see *Epilegomena,* § *Chattuarii.*

[4] *Frisii.*—Except political importance, the Frisians have all the elements of ethnological interest.

To the Dutchman and German they are deserving of attention, because they represent the native Germanic type in its purest and least modified form. Their fen localities have kept them from intermixture of blood: they have also preserved for them, through a long series of vicissitudes, a considerable amount of political independence.

The Scandinavian sees in the Frisian language, the Germanic tongue most allied to his own; the descendant of that Gothic language out of which the Icelandic, or Old Norse, was developed.

To the Englishman they are of pre-eminent interest. The Frisians of Heligoland are British subjects. But, besides this, there is another series of facts.

a. The mother-tongue of the present English, the Anglo-Saxon, is extinct on the Continent. It has been wholly replaced by a High German dialect as the literary language, and by the Platt-Deutsch as the speech of the country-people.

b. The sister-tongue to the Anglo-Saxon—the Old Saxon of Westphalia—is similarly lost, and similarly replaced.

c. The tongue next to these, in the order of affinity, is the Frisian,

a form of the Gothic speech nearer our own language than either the Dutch of Holland, the Scandinavian dialects, or the High German.

In another new and peculiar point of view, the Frisians claim notice. Their history is, to a certain extent, a *physical* history. Many branches of the stem to which they belong have been lopped off by the hand of man, by war, by famine, by oppression bravely withstood. But others have given way to a stronger and more unconquerable power—that of Nature. It is the Frisian area that most of the great inundations of the North Sea have broken in upon. What Vesuvius has been to Campania, Ætna to Sicily, Hecla to Iceland, the Ocean has been to Frisia.

The proper complement to the ethnology of this branch, would be the physical history of the North Sea; and this is what Clemens, the best investigator of the least known part of the family —the North Frisians—has sketched.

The Frisians have ever been the people of a *retiring frontier*, *i.e.*, whilst others have encroached on their occupancies, they have never, within the historical period, been successful invaders and permanent aggressors elsewhere. Not, at least, by land. By *sea*, the case may have been different; so different, that in our own island much that passes for Anglo-Saxon in origin may be Frisian; a matter to which a special notice has been dedicated.*

On the west the Ocean; on the north the Danes and Low Germans; on the south the Low Germans have been the encroachers.

The fact of the Frisians having thus suffered from encroachment, rather than gained by aggression, has a practical bearing.

Frisian occupancy may be inferred from certain characteristics, hereafter to be illustrated: and these characteristics we find in localities far beyond the present Frisian area. Now, had the Frisians been a family of conquerors, the inference would be that the introduction was recent, and that, upon some earlier occupancy, Frisian elements might have been engrafted. But as the truth is the reverse of this; as the Frisians have habitually retreated rather than advanced, the conclusion is different; and as Frisiann ames of geographical localities—for of this sort are the characteristics in question—may reasonably be assumed to denote Frisian occupancy *anterior* to that of the present dominant population.

Of all the ancient names of German populations, the term *Frisii* has been the most permanent. Less altered in form than *Chatti*, as

* In the third edition of the English Language of the present writer.

compared to *Hesse*, and applied to the population of its original area, it denotes the Frisii of Tacitus, the present Frieslanders of Friesland, with a *minimum* amount of alteration.

As to whether the name itself be German, it would be an unnecessary refinement to doubt it. Nevertheless, the criticism which applies to the word *Suevi* is applicable to Frisii also. It is *applicable;* but, although applicable, it by no means follows that it should be *applied*. By considering the term as *Keltic* a few difficulties respecting the connection between the Frisii and Chauci might, perhaps, be removed. On the other hand, we have Pliny's word Frisia-*bones;* a compound almost certainly German.

The shadow of uncertainty that rests over the language to which the root *Fris-* belongs, is created by the fact of the *Frisii* being mentioned by Cæsar, under the name now before us: for Cæsar's informants were Gauls, and, I am inclined to think that, *as a general rule*, the Gallic name of a Germanic population was different from the native one.

Again; the name of the national hero is so often the name of the people who are addicted to his *cultus*—in other words, the national hero is so often an *eponymus* to the nation—that when this is not the case, a slight presumption is raised against the name being indigenous, native, and vernacular. This is the case here. The great mythological Frisian is *Finn*. We should expect some such name as *Fris*.

Thus, in the Traveller's Song, we have—

> "Fin Folc-walding
> [Weóld] Fresna cynne—"
> or,
> "Finn, the son of Folcwalda
> (Ruled) the race of Frisians."

All this, however, may be, and probably is, over-refinement.

The later form which the word Frisii takes is one in *-n-*, the so-called *weak* form of the Gothic grammarians. Hence, whilst Tacitus, Pliny, Ptolemy, and Dion, write *Frisii*, *Φρίσσιοι*, and *Φρείσιοι*, Procopius has *Φρίσσονες*.

The Anglo-Saxon writers also use the form in *-an; e.g.*, *Fresones* in Beda, and *Frisan* in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

The form *Frisia-bon-es*, in Pliny, has been already noticed. It is clearly a compound. The power and original form of the second

element is not so clear. Considering the nature of the Frisian *habitats*, I believe it to represent the word *veen=fen*. This, however, is but a guess.

The Frisian characteristic alluded to above is—

1. The great preponderance of compound words, ending in the equivalent to the English *-ham*, and German *-heim*,—*e.g.*, Threeking-*ham*, Oppen-*heim*.

2. The peculiar form this element takes.

This is *-um*, the *h* being omitted, and the vowel being *u*.

In Friesland itself so abundant are these compounds of *-um*, that two out of three (sixteen out of twenty-four) of the places noted in the map within a few miles of Leeuwarden, end in that element. *

Zeeland.—Here but few words are compounded of the equivalent to *-ham* and *-heim* at all; perhaps none except the word Ritt*hem*; which is in *h* and *e*.

Thus we have the two extremes; *i.e.*, the Frisian topography at its *maximum* in Friesland, and at its *minimum* in Zeeland.

Between these two extremes the following is the order of transition.

Groningen.—Here the Frisian compound predominates, and that with the Frisian form. In the *arrondissement* of Appingadam only, we have eighteen names in *-um*.

In Groningen, however, we find occasion to mention another Frisian characteristic—the omission of *-n* and *-m* at the end of words. Hence, all true Frisian compounds of *-man* end in *-ma*; as Hette-*ma* and Halberts-*ma*; whilst the numerous words that, in a fen-country, are compounded of *-dam*, take such forms as the following words in the *arrondissement* of Winschoten—Holwier-*da* (not *-dam*), Utwier-*da*, &c.

Now in Winschoten, although the Frisian characteristic of the final *-a* be carried to a great extent, the forms in *-um* are few. In the next province—

Drenthe—they do not occur at all. But Drenthe, like Winschoten, seems to be reclaimed land, and as such, the *habitat* of a population less aboriginal than that of Friesland and Groningen.

Oberijssel.—*a. Arrondissement of Zwolle.*—Here we have three compounds of *h-m*, *viz.*: Blanken-*ham*, Windes-*heim*, and Wils-*um*—all three different; one Saxon, one German, and one Frisian.

* The map referred to is Van Langenheuzen's, A.D. 1843; the scale being a small quarto page to each Province. No topographical knowledge beyond what is thus supplied is pretended to.

b. Arrondissement of Deventer.—One compound in *-um*, Hess-*um*.

c. Arrondissement of Almelo.—Three compounds— Ootmars-*um*, Rent-*um*, and Ross-*um*.

Notwithstanding this diminution of Frisian characteristics, there is between Almelo and Ommen a *Vrisen-veen=Frisian fen.*

Gelderland.—a. Arrondissement of Arnhem.—Here Arn*hem* takes the form in *hem*. On the contrary, Hels*um* and Renk*um* occur, and so do Bennek*om* and Ellek*om*.

c. Arrondissement of Nimeguen.—Forms in *-um* rare, if any.

d. Arrondissement of Tiel.—Heukel-*um*, Gellic-*um*, and Ross-*um*.

North Brabant.—Three or four forms in *-um* at most.

b. Arrondissement of Zutphen.—Forms in *-em* almost (or wholly) to the exclusion of those in *-um*—Loch*em*, Zel*hem*.

Limburg.—Here are four forms, Wess*um*, Seven*um*, Wans*um*, and Otters*um*; but they occur in the northern *arrondissement* (that of Roermonde) only, and that in contact with Groet-*hem* and Baex-*hem*.

Utrecht.—Utter, or nearly utter, absence of Frisian forms.

South Holland.—Ditto.

North Holland.—a. In the arrondissement of Amsterdam.—Blaric*um*, Helmers*um*, Buss*um*.

b. In the arrondissement of Hoorn.—Wogn*um*.

Notwithstanding the paucity of Frisian forms, part of North Holland is called *West Friesland;* from which we may infer that, even though the termination *-um* be non-existent, there may have been a Frisian occupancy.

But what shall we say to the converse of this? How far is the presence of such forms absolutely Frisian?

I can only say, in answer to this, that the *Anglo*-Saxon forms are regularly *-hám*, the Platt-Deutsch *-hem*, the High-German *-heim*, and the Norse *-jem* (*-yem*); and that in England, Switzerland, Iceland, Sweden, and those parts of Germany, where the Frisian occupancy can fairly be presumed never to have extended, I have sought for the form *-um* in vain.

Observe the *Italics* in the word *Anglo*-Saxon.

If any exception is to be made in favour of the termination *-um*=*-heim*, and *-hám*, it is in favour of the *Old* Saxons. Two reasons stand for this.

1. The Old Saxon omitted the *h-* in simple words, where it

occurs in all the other Germanic tongues; even the Anglo-Saxon and the Frisian. Thus their forms equivalent to—

A.S.		ENGLISH.		O.S.
hire	=	her	=	îr.
hira	=	their	=	îro.

2. Drat-*um*, Stock-*um*, Bokk-*um*, occur in Old Saxon localities.

I admit this exception, and, although it is by no means impossible that either certain Old Saxon localities may once have been Frisian, or that Frisian colonies may have been located on the points in question, consider that the *-um* may have been *Old* Saxon as well as Frisian—but not anything else.

To proceed. In Scandinavia, the termination in the root *h-m* at all, or in any form, is rare. The termination that replaces it is *-by;* an important affix, and one which plays the same part in the minute ethnology of Scandinavia that *-um* does here.

With this preliminary, we may investigate the northern portions of the Frisian area; having begun with the extremities first.

Sleswick and Holstein.—Just west of Töndern, about an English mile to the north, we have a hamlet called, for some distance, Bunder-*by;* and south of this, for some distance, there is no place ending in *-by*.

About four English miles to the north-west of Leck, we have a hamlet named Wees-*by*, and west of this no place ends in *-by*.

About Hus-*um* is a remarkable starting-point. A new set of names comes in. These are only partially Frisian; at the same time they are not Danish. Where these are not Frisian they are *Platt-Deutsch.*

However, between Husum, Bunder-*by*, Wees-*by*, and the sea, all is Frisian—positively as well as negatively.

Within these lines come Olz-hus-*um*, Bogel-*um*, Lug-*um*, Up-hus-*um*, Karl-*um*, Ris-*um*, Klint-*um*, Barg-*um*, Stad-*um*, Dorp-*um*, Bordel-*um*, Bakkel-*um*, Stukk-*um*, Hus-*um*, and a little to the south-west of the line Rantr-*um*.

What do we find beyond? First let our attention be turned to the south, and south-east, so as to see whether they are reasons for connecting these Frisians of Sleswick with those of Hanover.

South of Husum, a projecting block of low fertile marsh-land is bounded on two sides by the sea and the Eyder, and on the

third by the road to Frederikstadt, and Schwabsted. Here but one place ends in *-um*, Bros-*um*, on the sea. None end in *-by*. The nomenclature is Platt-Deutsch. Still, the single word Bros-*um* indicates a Frisian population—to which it should be added, that the whole country is reclaimed land, consisting wholly of embanked marshes. This is the fertile country of Eydersted; at present Platt-Deutsch.

South of Eydersted and the Eyder comes Ditmarsh—the beloved native country of Niebuhr. It falls in two divisions—

a. North Ditmarsh, of which Heide is the chief town, contains nothing ending in *-um*. On the contrary, several names are Platt-Deutsch.

b. South Ditmarsh; few or no forms in *-um*.

But Ditmarsh only takes us southwards. The parts *west* of Husum require notice. The triangle formed by a line drawn from Husum to Sleswick, from Sleswick to Rendsburg, and from Rendsburg to the Eyder (this last being very irregular) gives a new area.

Nothing ends in *-um* here. All that points towards Friesland is a drain named *Fresen*-delf, on the right bank of the river Tren, near Schwabsted; and even this is on the very western extremity of the parts marked out.

Neither do any places end in *-um* between Sleswick, the Eckernfjord, and Rendsburg. Hence, the Frisians of the parts between Husum and Töndern are isolated.

So much for the south and east. Let us now look to the north; or rather to the north and east; remembering that, in this direction, whatever is not Frisian will be Danish—not Platt-Deutsch.

North.—Between Töndern and Ripen the places in *-by* are arranged in one, those in *-um* in another column.

Oster-*by*.	Hus-*um*.
Wiis-*by*.	Ball-*um*.
Gammel-*by*.	Woll-*um*.
Nor-*by*.	Win-*um*.
Kohl-*by*.	Nust-hus-*um*.
Reis-*by*.	Bjerr-*um*.
Kirke-*by*.	———
Mol-*by*.	———
Meel-*by*.	———

The preponderance is in favour of the Danish form. Besides

which, we have a place called Kier-*gaard*; and as *gaard*=*house* in Danish, this is an additional element in that quarter.

On the other hand the compound Kirke-*by*=*Church-town*, should be noticed: as it shows, that, in that case at least, the Danish name is posterior to the introduction of Christianity. I do not remember any such Frisian form as Tjerk-*um* (the Frisian equivalent to Kirke-by); a fact which gives us negative evidence in favour of the antiquity of the Frisian names.

North-east.—For the square formed by lines drawn from Husum to Sleswick, from Sleswick to Flensburg, from Flensburg to Leck, and from Leck to Husum, there is only one place in *-um*, Bordel-*um*, and as this is on the right bank of the Tren, it may be considered as belonging to the true Frisian area; being its most western locality. Roughly speaking, the preponderating signs of Frisian occupancy cease when we pass the Tren.

West of this line, and in the series of angular projections formed by the Eckernfjord, the Slie, the Flensborg Fjord, the Apenrade Fjord, and the Hadersleven Fjord, we expect to find even fewer Frisian names than we found in the centre of the peninsula. Yet such is not the case.

a. Between the Eckernfiord and the sea is an Orn-*um*, and a Schwastr-*um*.

b. Between the Slie and the Fiensburg Fiord is a Wri-*um*, and a Brunshol-*um*.

c. Between the Flensburg and Apenrade Fiords is a Roll-*um*; though quite at the western (north-western) extremity.

d. Between the Apenrade and Hadersleven Fiords are Bod-*um* and Lyg-*um*; both on the eastern side.

In the parts necessary to fill up the vacancy, and comprise the centre of North Sleswick, along with a part of South Jutland, bounded by lines drawn from Leck to Flensburg, from Flensburg to Kolding, from Kolding to Ripe, from Ripe to Töndern, and from Töndern to Leck, we have a few Frisian forms—Selli-*um*-hauge, on the south-east of Kolding, and opposite the isle of Fyen, being the most eastern; south of which, and also near the sea, is Stubb-*um*.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the distribution of the Frisian forms is remarkable.

First, we have them to the exclusion of the Danish and Platt-Deutsch ones.

Next, mixed with Danish forms in *-by*; and—

Thirdly, mixed with Platt-Deutsch forms of different descriptions.

The distribution, however, to as far as it has hitherto gone, has applied to the Continent only, not to the islands.

In those of the North Sea, or those on the *western* side, it is as follows:

a. In Föhr (which from being central it is convenient to begin with) we have Duns-*um*, Utters-*um*, Hedehus-*um*, Vits-*um*, Niebel-*um*, Baldiks-*um*, Vreks-*um*, Oevens-*um*, Midl-*um*, Alkers-*um*, Borgs-*um*, Toft-*um*, Klint-*um*, Olds-*um*, Duns-*um*.

b. In Sylt, Horn-*um*, Mors-*um*, Arks-*um*, Keit-*um*, Tinn-*um*—*all in the southern half of the island.*

c. In *northern* Romö, Toft-*um*.

d. In Fanö, none.

e. f. g. In Amröm (to the *south* of Sylt), in Pelvorm, and in Nordstant, none. Here the names are Platt-Deutsch.

If we now look back upon the distribution of local names in the Cimbric peninsula, we shall find that—

a. There is a part purely Frisian, *i.e.*, the parts between Töndern and Husum.

b. A part mixed with Danish, *i.e.*, North Jutland.

c. A part mixed with Platt-Deutsch, *i.e.*, Ditmarsh; and, besides these—

d. Parts where there is an intermixture of different degrees of complexity of Frisian, Danish, and Platt-Deutsch.

Now in the parts about Husum, *i.e.*, the parts where the endings are most purely Frisian, the *language is at the present moment Frisian*—the North Frisian so-called. I have heard it spoken, and, imperfectly spoken it, myself this very year.

And in the islands of the North Sea, and many parts about it, there either is North Frisian, or, has been so, within the memory of man.

And in Eydersted and Ditmarsh it has been so within the historical period.

Is this Frisian new or old? Have the populations who speak it encroached upon the other occupants of the peninsula or *vice versâ?* The latter is the case. Some of the reasons for this statement have already been given. They applied, however, only to the relations between the *Low Germans* and the Frisians. Those of the Danes require further notice.

I. *The North Frisian language is no recent introduction.*—*a.* It falls into numerous dialects and sub-dialects. For the islands

alone Clemens enumerates three, the Sylt, the Amröm, and the Föhr. On the continent, each parish has its peculiar variety. Some of these arise from intermixture of Danish and German; but many are quite independent of anything of the sort.

b. It is notably different from the Frisian of Holland. The two forms, though mutually intelligible, are not very easily understood.

c. It is more like the Heligoland, than it is to the East or West Frisian. This would not be the case if the colony were of recent origin, unless we suppose that it was sent out from that small island. If the two dialects represented colonies from some common portion of the continent they would be more alike than they are.

II. *The compounds in* -um *are all old names.—a.* They are never attached to such words as *tjerke=church*, &c.

b. Few (I am afraid to say *no*) Frisian terminations are attached to Danish or German words. On the contrary, many complex Danish and German compounds are formed from simpler Frisian ones.

III. The Danish has encroached upon the Frisian ever since the beginning of the historical period. No instance of the reverse has been recorded.

The evidence of the North Frisian having once been continuous with the Frisian of Friesland and Westphalia, is satisfactory, the displacement of it having taken place within the historical period; and its history is to be found in that of East Friesland, Oldenburg, Delmenhorst, and Bremen.

Can we carry the Frisian as far as the Islands of the Baltic? In Fyen, and in Sealand, there are one or two names in *-um*.

There is one direction, however, in which we may not carry it; or, rather, there is one direction in which we must be careful not to carry it too far. This is that of the *south-eastern* parts of the Sleswick peninsula. The oldest occupants here were *Slavonians;* and the parts between Hamburg and Kiel, the Isle of Femern, the Isle of Alsen, and the opposite coast, must be considered as Slavonic in the first instance, Low German in the second, and Low German and Danish together in the third.

The further extent of the original Frisian occupancy, the characteristics of the Frisian tongue, and the relations of that tongue to Scandinavian, are considered in *Epilegomena,* § Φιραῖσι.

[5] *Majoribus minoribusque.*]—Two populations of Germany are divided by more than one ancient writer into *majores* and *minores*

—the Frisii (as here) and the Bructeri; each falling into two divisions so named.

Probably, this denotes that either from *migration* or *conquest*, the continuity of the original area has been broken, and that whilst the *majores* represent the main stock, the *minores* form the outlying portion.

Neither name (notwithstanding the present text) necessarily denotes size, since the great nation of the Visigoths was called *Gothi minores*.

Populations other than German are so divided, *e.g.*, the *Scordisci*.

XXXV. Hactenus in occidentem Germaniam novimus. In septemtrionem ingenti flexu redit. Ac primò statim Chaucorum gens,[1] quamquam incipiat a Frisiis, ac partem litoris occupet, omnium, quas exposui, gentium lateribus obtenditur, donec in Chattos usque sinuetur. Tam immensum terrarum spatium non tenent tantùm Chauci, sed et implent: populus inter Germanos nobilissimus, quique magnitudinem suam malit justitiâ tueri: sine cupiditate, sine impotentiâ, quieti secretique, nulla provocant bella, nullis raptibus aut latrociniis populantur. Idque præcipuum virtutis ac virium argumentum est, quòd, ut superiores agant, non per injurias adsequuntur. Prompta tamen omnibus arma, ac, si res poscat, exercitus: plurimum virorum equorumque: et quiescentibus eadem fama.

NOTE ON SECTION XXXV.

[1] *Chaucorum gens.*]—The *Ch*, probably, represents the guttural *ch* of the Germans, as in *auch*, *noch*. In Greek it is Χ.

That one of the letters *c* is aspirated is nearly certain. The only form where the *h* or its equivalent is wholly wanting, is in some MSS. (Καῦκοι) of Strabo.

The forms with the *first c* aspirated (*Chauci*, Χαῦκοι) are to be found in Pliny, Tacitus, Suetonius.

Those with the *second* c aspirated (*Cauchi*, Καῦχοι) occur in Velleius Paterculus, Spartianus, Ptolemy.

Dion Cassius has *both* forms Χαῦκις and Καῦχοι.

Lucan and Claudian divide the vowels and make them trisyllabic. This division of the vowels is of some importance in the history of ethnological *conjecture*, since it brings the forms *Caÿci* and *Caüci* to a resemblance with the Καοῦλκοι of Strabo, and then with the *Chabilci*.

The Chauci fell into two divisions—the Chauci *minores* between the Ems and Weser, the Chauci *majores* between the Weser and Elbe.

It is safe to identify them with the *Hoc-ingas* of the Traveller's Song and Beowulf—the termination *-ing* being a patronymic, the *-as* the sign of the plural number, and the *ch* in *Chauci* equivalent to *h* in the same way that *Ch*=*H* in *Chatti* and *Hesse*.

It is safe, too, to consider the Chauci as members of the Frisian section of the Gothic stock.

In the battle of Finnesburh, *Hnæf*, the eponymus of the *Hanoverians*, the son of Finn, the son of Folcwalda, has, as his queen, Hildeburg, the *Hoc-ing*. I do not consider that this gives us anything historical. All that it does is to connect the *Chauci* and *Frisii* (*Hoc-ings* and *Frisians*) by certain political relations; and carry the area of their legendary localities as far as Hanover and Hildesheim.

Considerable difficulties are involved in the statement that the Chauci extended as far as the frontier of the Chatti; difficulties turning upon the relationship between the Old Saxon and the Anglo-Saxon languages.

If we join the Chauci and Chatti, we do one of two things; we either—

a. Disconnect the country of the Old-Saxons of Westphalia from that of the Anglo-Saxons: or else we—

b. Enclose two such important populations as the Old Saxons and Anglo-Saxons within too small an area.

Two other points connected with the ethnography of the *Chauci* still stand over.

1. The discrepancy between Tacitus and Pliny as to their physical and political condition. What Tacitus says may be seen in the text. It is much the same as Velleius Paterculus had said before:—"Receptæ Cauchorum nationes; omnis eorum juventus, *infinita numero*, immensa corporibus, situ locorum tutissima, traditis armis . . ante imperatoris procubuit tribunal."

Pliny's evidence, however, differs:—"Sunt in septemtrione visæ nobis Chaucorum (gentes) . . . . . Vasto ibi meatu, bis dierum noctiumque singularum intervallis, effusus in immensum agitur Oceanus, æternam operiens rerum naturæ controversiam; dubiumque terræ sit, an parte in maris. Illic misera gens tumulos obtinet altos aut tribunalia structa manibus ad experimenta altissimi æstus, casis ita impositis, navigantibus similes, cum integant aquæ circumdata, naufragis vero, cum recesserint: fugientesque cum mari pisces circa tuguria venantur. Non pecudem his habere, non lacte ali, ut finitimis, ne cum feris quidem dimicare contingit, omni procul abacto frutice. Ulva et palustri junco funes nectunt ad prætexenda piscibus retia: captumque manibus lutum ventis magis quam sole siccantes, terra cibos et rigentia septemtrione viscera sua urunt. Potus nonnisi ex imbre servato scrobibus in vestibulo domus. Et hæ gentes, si vincantur hodie a populo Romano, servire se dicunt. Ita est profecto: multis fortuna parcit in pœnam."—xvi. 1.

The explanation of this difference in the way of testimony, lies in the likelihood of the Chauci of the lowest fen levels, exposed to malaria, exposed to inundations, and exposed to piracy, being a miserable race as compared with those of the higher and more inland country; a view which reconciles both statements. But it also supplies a reason against carrying the Chauci too far inland. Probably, the Confederation was wider than the nation.

In the more marshy parts of Eydersted, Ditmarsh, and Sleswick, the reclaimed lands, with their embankments, are called *Koge*. This is, possibly, the *Chauc-* in *Chauci*. If so, the *Koge* were the lands of the *Hoc-ings*, and Tacitus has given us the name of the country rather than of the people, the Germans that of the people rather than the land. This, again, is a reason against carrying the area of the Proper Chauci too far inland.

XXXVI. In latere Chaucorum Chattorumque, Cherusci[1] nimiam ac marcentem diu pacem illacessiti nutrierunt: idque jucundius, quàm tutius fuit: quia inter impotentes et validos falsò quiescas: ubi manu agitur, modestia ac probitas nomina superioris sunt.

Ita qui olim "boni æquique Cherusci," nunc "inertes ac stulti" vocantur: Chattis victoribus fortuna in sapientiam cessit. Tracti ruinâ Cheruscorum et Fosi,[2] contermina gens, adversarum rerum ex æquo socii, cùm in secundis minores fuissent.

NOTES ON SECTION XXXVI.

[1] *Cherusci.*]—The first great fact in the history of the Cherusci is, that they were the confederates of Arminius, and the conquerors of Varus.

The next is that they withstood the aggressions of their own countrymen as steadily as they did those of Rome.

The Cherusci are mentioned by Cæsar, and mentioned as the hereditary enemies of the Suevi. The Cherusci, too, it was who first checked the conquests and consolidations of Maroboduus.

We may look upon the Cherusci * as the heads of a great confederation, not only on the strength of their history, but on the evidence of ancient writers, *e.g.*, Strabo, *οἱ Χηροῦσκοι καὶ οἱ τούτων ὑπήκοοι* —Tacitus, "Cherusci, *sociique eorum.*"

If so, the import of the name may fluctuate, and sometimes mean a particular people, sometimes serve as a collective designation, including several such smaller divisions. This assumption eases many difficulties—perhaps, indeed, it is absolutely necessary. We hear so continually of great nations, like the Chatti, Cherusci, Sigambri and others, being conterminous, that, if we take the texts wherein such notices occur literally, we leave no room for several minor nations or tribes.

Thus, in the present instance, there are special statements which bring the Cherusci—

a. As far south as the Chatti.

b. As far north as the Chauci.

c. As far west as the Sicambri.

What room does this leave for such populations as the Chamavi, Angrivarii, Fosi, &c.? Little, if any; especially if we bring in

* The full import of the Cheruscan resistance to Rome, the value of the patriotism of Arminius, and the extent to which the Cheruscan glory is as much English as German, are well developed in Professor Creasy's "The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World," foremost amongst which he places the defeat of the legions of Varus.

other passages which connect the previous populations with each other—*e.g.*, there is the statement of Tacitus, that the Chauci and Chatti joined—"donec in Chattos usque sinuetur."

Considerations of this kind justify us in believing that, when certain great nations are spoken of as acting a conspicuous part in history, certain minor ones may be included in the general name.

Hence, I believe that when the Cherusci are spoken of in general history, the Chamavi and Angrivarii are included in one of the two denominations; and the words are used in a *political* sense. The *ethnological*, and narrower sense of the words, occurs only when the details of the geography or history require separation and specification.

The country of the Proper Cheruscans was bounded on the west by the *Angri-varii;* for I suppose *Engern*, near Herford—the traditionary battle-field of the Arminian victory—to represent that name.

To the south-west of the Angrivarii lay the Chamavi—Hamm being, again, supposed to retain their designation.

On the north-east we may probably carry the Proper Cheruscans as far as the Hartz. For this, however, see *Epilegomena*, § *Harudes*.

It is now time to inquire whether the Cherusci and their allies represented an ethnological section of the Germanic populations as they, certainly, did a political one. The answer to this is in the affirmative. Without committing ourselves to the doctrine that the Cheruscan league *exactly* coincided with the Cheruscan form of the German language, we may safely say that such was *nearly* the case. If so, the Cherusci are of the same ethnological importance with the Frisians.

Of the *Saxon* division of the German dialects as opposed to the Platt-Deutsch and High German, and of the Saxon nationalities as opposed to the Frank, Alemannic, and Gothic, Lombard and Burgundian, the Cherusci are the southern representatives.

Of the Cherusci, in the wide sense of the term, the north and north-western members appear in the eighth century under the name of *Old* Saxons, this meaning the Saxons of the continent, or the mother-country, in opposition to the Saxons of England, or Anglo-Saxons.

If the Cherusci of Tacitus and the earlier writers be the Saxons of Beda and later ones, how comes it that the one name never appears in the classical, and the other never in the German writers? Cæsar,

Strabo, Velleius Paterculus, all speak of the Cherusci, and all say nothing about the Saxons. Ptolemy, as is well known, is the first writer who mentions them. On the other hand Claudian is the last writer in whom we find the word Cherusci.

> ——venit accola silvæ
> Bructerus Hercyniæ, latisque paludibus exit
> Cimber, et ingentes Albin liquere Cherusci.
>
> Consul. iv. Honor. 450.

As long as we have the Cherusci there are no Saxons. As soon as we meet with the Saxons the Cherusci disappear.

If we wish to cut the Gordian knot, we can have recourse to the assumption of migration and displacement—in which the Old Saxons cease to be the descendants of the Cherusci and their allies, and represent a new and intrusive population as foreign to the old Cheruscan country of Germany as they were to that of the Britons. There are certain texts that encourage this view, *e.g.*, the present notice of the fallen state of the Cherusci and Fosi is in favour of their being easily displaced and superseded by some more flourishing immigrants.

Valeat quantum. It only does half the business. It only extinguishes the Cherusci. The presence and preponderance of the Saxons it leaves unexplained.

The full import of this must be admitted.

a. The Saxons, which by assumption are supposed to replace the Cherusci, cannot be got from the country of the *Chatti*. The *Chatti* were High Germans.

b. Nor yet from that of the Chauci. The majority of the Chauci were Frisians.

c. Nor yet from that of the Lower Rhine. The language here was Platt-Deutsch.

More than this—they could not have come from any small or inconsiderable country at all, from none of the nooks or corners between the Great Frisian, Platt-Deutsch, High German, and Slavonic areas. The differences between the Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon dialects, show that the common language was spoken over a large tract of ground, and that for a considerable length of time.

The assumption of a Saxon immigration into the Cheruscan territory, is not only gratuitous, but it engenders as many difficulties as it removes.

In ordinary cases I should resort *at once* to the supposition that the two names belonged to different languages, and repeat the reasoning that applied to *Chatti* and *Suevi*. To do this, however, here, requires grave consideration: so good a case can be made out on both sides for the indigenous and native character of the name. Both *Cherusci* and *Saxo* seem to be German words—one as German as the other.

Reasons, however, against admitting *both* to be German, and—

Reasons for choosing the former instead of the latter, *Cherusci* rather than *Saxones*, will be found in the *Epilegomena*, §§ *Saxons* and *Harudes*.

In the term Cherusci, in its wider sense, I include, as may partly be anticipated, the following populations:—

1. The Angrivarii.
2. The Chamavi.
3. The Dulgibini.
4. The Fosi.
5. The Chasuarii.

[2] *Fosi.*]—Probably occupants of the banks of the river Fuse, or the parts about the town of Celle.

XXXVII. Eumdem Germaniæ situm proximi Oceano Cimbri[1] tenent, parva nunc civitas, sed gloriâ ingens: veterisque famæ latè vestigia[2] manent, utrâque ripâ castra, ac spatia, quorum ambitu nunc quoque metiaris molem manusque gentis, et tam magni exercitûs fidem. Sexcentesimum et quadragesimum annum Urbs nostra agebat, cùm primùm Cimbrorum audita sunt arma, Cæcilio Metello ac Papirio Carbone consulibus. Ex quo si ad alterum Imperatoris Trajani consulatum computemus, ducenti ferme et decem anni colliguntur: tamdiu Germania vincitur. Medio tam longi ævi spatio, multa invicem damna. Non

Samnis, non Pœni, non Hispaniæ, Galliæve, ne Parthi quidem sæpius admonuere: quippe regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas. Quid enim aliud nobis, quàm cædem Crassi, amisso et ipse Pacoro, infra Ventidium dejectus Oriens objecerit? At Germani Carbone, et Cassio, et Scauro Aurelio, et Servilio Cæpione, Cn. quoque Manlio fusis vel captis, quinque simul consulares exercitus populo Romano, Varum, tresque cum eo legiones, etiam Cæsari abstulerunt: nec impunè C. Marius in Italiâ, divus Julius in Galliâ, Drusus ac Nero et Germanicus in suis eos sedibus perculerunt. Mox ingentes C. Cæsaris minæ in ludibrium versæ. Inde otium, donec occasione discordiæ nostræ et civilium armorum, expugnatis legionum hibernis, etiam Gallias affectavere: ac rursus pulsi inde, proximis temporibus triumphati magis quàm victi sunt.

NOTES ON SECTION XXXVII.

[1] *Cimbri.*]—A measure of the scantiness of satisfactory evidence as to the Cimbro-Teutonic war may be collected from Niebuhr. For the defeat of Cn. Papirius Carbo, near Noreia, in 113 B.C., he quotes Appian and the Epitome Liviana; for their actions with M. Junius Silanus, and M. Aurelius Scaurus, he regrets that Livy is wanted, and that a writer so late as Zonaras, is his best authority. Florus, Eutropius, and Orosius supply the next best *data*. All, however, derive their materials from Livy—himself a writer one hundred and fifty years after the event. But we may go farther than this, and by turning to the life of Marius see the confusion into which Plutarch falls, and the speculation in which he indulges.

Beyond this lies the consideration of the writers anterior to the time of Livy. Valerius Antias is especially quoted by Orosius; and, of all writers, Valerius Antias is the least to be trusted.

The most naked statements of facts is as follows:—

A.D. 113.—The Cimbri defeat the consul Papirius Carbo, near Noreia in Styria.

A.D. 109—107.—The Cimbri, Tigurini, and Ambrones defeat

M. Junius Silanus, L. Cassius Longinus, and M. Aurelius Scaurus, in Roman Gaul, at some place unknown.

A.D. 105.— The same defeat Cn. Manlius and Q. Servilius Cæpio.

A.D. 102.—The Teutones are defeated by Marius near Aix in Provence.

A.D. 101.—The Cimbri, Tigurini, Ambrones, and Teutones are defeated by Marius in the Tyrol.

But, as the general character of an historical transaction may be known even where the details are forgotten, there are still points upon which the great writers of the close of the republic may be consulted.

Now what did *Cæsar* consider their ethnological affinities to be? Gallic. Sallust? Gallic. Velleius Paterculus? Gallic. It is only the later writers that carry their origin north of Gaul.

But the *Teutones* are German at least. It is the same word as *Deut-sch.* The preliminaries to this question are to be found in not. in v. *Germania.*

It is an undoubted fact that writers as early as Virgil, Lucan, Juvenal, and Martial, use the epithet *Teutonicus:* and when they do so they mean after the fashion of *Teutons.*

But it is no undoubted fact that they mean thereby *German.* They mean *of or belonging to the well-known enemy conquered by Marius,* without defining the country of that enemy.

It is also an undoubted fact that writers of the *tenth* century use the epithet *Teutonicus* as equivalent to *German, i.e.,* as another form of *Theotiscus.*

This, however, is after (and not before) the word *Theotiscus* has been used for *Germanus.*

In other words, the epithet *Teutonicus,* although really a derivative of *Teutones,* passes for another form of *Theot-iscus,* or as a derivative from *Theot-* or *Diot-*, and so becomes a name for the Germans, simply because *Theotisci* had been a name for them before.

But *Theotisci* was no name for the Germans until the tenth century, about one thousand years after the first use of the word *Teuton.*

To take a measure of the magnitude of this paralogism, let us suppose an advocate for the Belgic origin of the Lowland Scotch, to argue in the following manner: —*Belg-* and *vulg-* are similar words; therefore the *Vulgar* tongue, and the *Belgic*

tongue are the same; therefore the *Belgæ* are *Vulgares.* This is no caricature. *Mutatis mutandis,* the argument alluded to runs—*Teut-on* and *Dut-ch* are similar words; therefore the *Dutch* tongue and the *Teutonic* tongue are the same; therefore the *Teutones* are *Deutsche.*

The doctrine of the present writer concerning the ethnology of these two populations was laid before the Philological Society as far back as 1844; and the article in which it is exhibited, is re-printed at the end of the present volume, which supersedes the necessity of a long note.

The chief addition that he would make to the quotations and references there found is the following extract from the Marmor Ancyranum:—"CIMBRIQUE ET CHARUDES ET SEMNONES ET EIUSDEM TRACTUS ALII GERMANORUM POPULI PER LEGATOS AMICITIAM MEAM ET POPULI ROMANI PETIERUNT."

This, combined with the fact of a country so far east as *Styria,* being the point whereon they fought their first battle, has suggested the possibility of their having been *Gauls* in the same way as the language of the *Gothini* was *Gallic, i.e.,* not at all, but Slavonians instead; a fact which would well account for the difficulty of definitely fixing them in any part of Gallia.

Nay—they *may* be *Germans.* At any rate, if one of the two populations must be Gothic, the claim is the strongest for the *Cimbri*—so utterly worthless is the argument from the word *Deut-sch.* The *Cimbri* are, at least, near enough the *Semnones* to be their allies; just as the *Semnones* were near enough the Germanic territory of Maroboduus to have belonged to his empire.

[2] *Veteris famæ—vestigia.*]—The disbeliever of the existence of either Cimbri or Teutones in Germany, sees in this statement merely an *inference.* Certain monuments (perhaps *Gravhöie, Ting-stene* or other similar well-known antiquities of the so-called Cimbric Chersonese) required explanation. The Roman antiquaries (for it must be remarked that the text gives us no hint that this view was native) referred them to the populations in question.

XXXVIII. Nunc de Suevis[1] dicendum est, quorum non una, ut Chattorum Tencterorumve, gens: majorem enim Germaniæ partem obtinent, propriis adhuc nationibus nominibusque discreti, quamquam in commune *Suevi* vocentur. Insigne gentis obliquare crinem, nodoque substringere. Sic Suevi a ceteris Germanis: sic Suevorum ingenui a servis separantur. In aliis gentibus, seu cognatione aliquâ Suevorum, seu (quod sæpe accidit) imitatione, rarum et intra juventæ spatium; apud Suevos, usque ad canitiem, horrentem capillum retro sequuntur, ac sæpe in ipso solo vertice religant: principes et ornatiorem habent: ea cura formæ, sed innoxiæ. Neque enim ut ament amenturve; in altitudinem quamdam et terrorem, adituri bella, compti, ut hostium oculis, ornantur.

NOTE ON SECTION XXXVIII.

[1] *Suevis.*]—The preliminaries to this note, are the note (on the *Chatti*) and the xv. section of the *Prolegomena.*

The Suevi of Tacitus lie east of those of Cæsar, since they nowhere reach the Rhine; in other words, the Suevi of Tacitus begin where those of Cæsar ended. This follows from the separation of *Suevi* from the *Chatti*—a separation not made by Cæsar. Tacitus requires *two* areas—one for the one population, the other for the other; Cæsar allows us to place both within the same.

The Suevi of Tacitus extended from the eastern frontier of the Chatti as far as the Elbe, at least; probably further.

As far as the *Suevi* of Tacitus coincide with the *Hermunduri* and *Chatti*, they are German. Beyond this they are Slavonians.

The term *Suevicum mare,* applied to a part of the Baltic, is referable to a different origin than the *Suevia*=*Suabia* of south-western Germany.—Vid. not. in v.

See also *Epilegomena,* § *Suevi.*

XXXIX. "Vetustissimos se nobilissimosque Suevorum" Semnones[1] memorant. Fides antiquitatis, religione firmatur. Stato tempore in silvam, auguriis patrum et priscâ formidine sacram, omnes ejusdem sanguinis populi legationibus coeunt, cæsoque publicè homine celebrant barbari ritûs horrenda primordia. Est et alia luco reverentia. Nemo nisi vinculo ligatus ingreditur, ut minor, et potestatem numinis præ se ferens: si fortè prolapsus est, attolli et insurgere haud licitum: per humum evolvuntur: eóque omnis superstitio respicit, tamquam inde initia gentis, ibi regnator omnium deus, cetera subjecta atque parentia. Adjicit auctoritatem fortuna Semnonum: centum pagis habitantur: magnoque corpore efficitur, ut se Suevorum caput credant.

NOTE ON SECTION XXXIX.

1 *Semnones.*]—Velleius Paterculus makes the Semnones conterminous with the Hermunduri, from whom they are separated by the *Elbe*—"ad flumen *Albim*, qui Semnonum Hermundurorumque fines præterfluit."—ii. 106.

For reasons for believing the Albis of Paterculus to be the Saale, see p. 148.

This gives their western limit. In the east Ptolemy carries them μέχρι τοῦ Σουήβου ποταμοῦ, and makes them conterminous with the *Silingi* on the south—πάλιν ὑπὸ μὲν τοὺς Σέμνονας οἰκοῦσι Σίλιγγαι.

Now *Silingi*=*Silesia.*

If so the area of the Semnones was, as near as possible, the present country of Saxony: and of the Slavonians of that country, I believe them to have been the Slavonic ancestors.

Strabo mentions the Semnones amongst the subjects of Maroboduus—Καὶ τὸ τῶν Σουήβων αὐτῶν μέγα ἔθνος Σέμνωνας.

At the beginning of the historical period of the populations between the Saale and Elbe, the chief nation is that of the *Sorabi*, a

name which appears as *Surabi, Suurbi, Siurbi, Surpe, Surfe, Surbi, Urbii*, the country being *Surabia* and *Suirbia*.

This name is native and Slavonic, as we learn from such forms as *Zrib-in* and *Zirb-in*; the *-n* being the adjectival affix.

It is a native name of great generality, since it represents the same root as the Σπορ- in the name Σπόροι, applied by Procopius to the south-eastern Slavonians, and the *S-rv* in *Servia*, the Σερϐ- in the Σέρϐλοι of Constantine Porphyrogenita.

The still-existing Slavonians of Upper Lusatia call themselves *Srbje*.

But that they extended as far west as the Saale, is shown by the following extract, one out of many similar. "*Sorabi Sclavi, qui campos inter Albim et Salam interjacentes incolunt*, in fines Thuringorum et Saxonum, qui eis erant contermini, prædandi causa ingressi."—Ann. Einh. ad an. 782, Pertz i. 163.

The *Surpe* were known to Alfred.

The Sorabian Slavonic language was spoken in Leipsic till A.D. 1327.—Schaffarik, p. 480.

In geographical, or else in political continuity, with the Sorabian Slavonians were the *Daleminci*, the *Siusli*, the *Milcieni* (for the parts about Bautzen), the *Lusici* (of Lusatia), and to the south-east the descendants of the Σίλιγγαι of Ptolemy, in the century called *Sleenzane*, and in the present *Schliesen=Silesians*.

Such seem to have been the descendants of the Semnones and the more eastern Suevi of Tacitus.

XL. Contra Langobardos[1] paucitas nobilitat: plurimis ac valentissimis nationibus cincti, non per obsequium, sed prœliis et periclitando tuti sunt. Reudigni[2] deinde, et Aviones,[3] et Angli,[4] et Varini,[5] et Eudoses,[6] et Suardones,[7] et Nuithones,[8] fluminibus aut silvis muniuntur: nec quidquam notabile in singulis, nisi quod in commune Herthum,[9] id est, Terram matrem colunt, eamque intervenire rebus hominum, invehi populis, arbitrantur. Est in insulâ[10] Oceani[11] ca-

stum nemus, dicatum in eo vehiculum, veste contectum, attingere uni sacerdoti concessum. Is adesse penetrali deam intelligit, vectamque bobus feminis multâ cum veneratione prosequitur. Læti tunc dies, festa loca, quæcumque adventu hospitioque dignatur. Non bella ineunt, non arma sumunt, clausum omne ferrum; pax et quies tunc tantùm nota, tunc tantùm amata, donec idem sacerdos satiatam conversatione mortalium deam templo reddat: mox vehiculum et vestes, et, si credere velis, numen ipsum secreto lacu abluitur. Servi ministrant, quos statim idem lacus haurit. Arcanus hinc terror, sanctaque ignorantia, quid sit id, quod tantùm perituri vident.

NOTES ON SECTION XL.

[1] *Langobardos.*]—"Longobardos vulgo ferunt nominatos a prolixâ *barbâ* et nunquam tonsâ."—Isidor. Hispal. Origg. ix. 2. "Certum est, Longobardos ab intactæ ferro *barbæ longitudine*, cum primitus Winili dicti fuerint, ita postmodum appellatos; nam juxta illorum linguam *lang* longam *bart* barbam significat."—Paül. Diacon. i. 9.

This is the etymology which was first received, and which is, perhaps, most generally credited. I do not know who first suggested the idea that the *-bard* in Lango-*bard* was the *bart* in hal-*bert* and *part*-izan, the name of warlike weapons; but in such a case, the *Langobardi* are not the *Long-beards* but the *Halberdiers*.

In the choice between these etymologies, it must be remembered, that of the two, the former was particularly likely to mislead a writer in the Latin language, on account of the similarity between the Latin *barba* and the German *bart*.

Again, it must be remembered that, in Beowulf and the Traveller's Song, we meet with the compound *Heaþo*-beardan; *heaþo-* being a prefix adapted to a warlike weapon, but not to a *beard*.

The habit of the Chatti *crinem barbamque summittere* (see § xxxi.), has been quoted in favour of translating *bart* by *beard*. In my mind, it goes the other way: since, if the habit of letting the beard grow were common amongst so large a population as the Chatti, the Lombard habit would have been the rule rather than the excep-

tion, and, as such, have failed in attracting notice, or developing a name.

Ptolemy's notice of the populations whose name end in *-bard* (and in Ptolemy there are *two* such) introduces a difficulty.

He first places Langobardi (Λαγγοβάρδοι) west and south of the Anglian Suevi (Σουῆβοι οἱ 'Αγγειλοί), these latter being on the Middle Elbe.

Afterwards he places Λακκοβάρδοι between the Chauci Majores and the Suevi; conterminous with the Angrivarii and Dulgubini (Δουλγούμνιοι).

This complication may, possibly, appear unimportant; so that the inquirer may, perhaps, think himself justified in disposing of it at once by assuming either an error in the reading, or an oversight in the author. Possibly, this view is right. Nevertheless, it is by no means necessarily so. The word in question is a compound, of which the qualifying element comes first. Hence, it is far from impossible that whilst *Langobardi* means *men with bards* (*beards* or *halberts*, as the case may be) of one sort, *Lakkobardi* may mean *men with bards* (*beards*, &c.) of another. True it is that the elements *Lang-* and *Lakk-* are suspiciously alike; neither can any satisfactory meaning be given to the latter word. Nevertheless, the inference of their being the same word is far from conclusive. Compound words may be alike and yet different; as are *Wessex* and *Essex*.

Zeuss gives a full, perhaps an excessive, import to this difference, considering that the *Lakkobardi* were not only the subsequent conquerors of Italy under Alboin (which the *Langobardi* were not) but that Ptolemy knowingly and intentionally distinguished between the two—"Diese Σουῆβοι können also nicht mit den Langobarden, den Eroberern Italiens, verwechselt werden; Ptolemæus selbst, scheint es, will sie unterschieden wissen, dass er diese, die schon in getrennten Sitzen aufgestellt sind, obwohl ihr name derselbe ist, auch verschieden Λακκοβάρδοι benennt."—p. 95.

Again—"Mit den Σουῆβοι Λαγγοβάρδοι des Ptolemæus dürfen nicht verwechselt werden seine Λακκοβάρδοι, &c."—p. 109.

It is doubtful, however, whether Ptolemy's own text requires this distinction to be thus stringently insisted on, *i.e.*, if we take the *Angri-varii* to be the centre for our inquiries, and admit *Engern* to represent their locality.—See § xxxiii.

Thus—*a.* The *Suevi Langobardi* are conterminous with the *Bructeri Minores* (Βουσάκτεροι οἱ μικροί) and the *Sigambri.* Of

these, they lie to the *south*, and a very little extension westwards will carry their frontier up to that of the *Angri-varii.*

b. Now it is the *Angrivarii* which the Λακκόβαρδοι succeed: the Angrivarian area being the only one which separates the two *Langobards.*

Still both the interruption and the difference of form must be taken as they are found; and explained rather than denied.

In Staffordshire, and many other parts of England, syllables ending in *-ing*, are pronounced *ingk*. Suppose this to have been the case with some dialect in Germany, from which the notice of a people called *Langobardan* was derived. The sound would then be *Langk-o-bardan.* To a Greek no way of spelling this would be more natural than by -κκ-; since it was by -γγ- that he already spelt the sound of *-ng.*

The Langobardi of Velleius are essentially those of Ptolemy, *i.e., Northern* Germans—"Receptæ Chaucorum nationes ... fracti *Langobardi,* gens etiam Germana feritate ferocior; denique ... usque ad flumen Albim. Romanus cum signis perductus exercitus." —ii. 106.

So are those of Tacitus—although they follow the *Suevi* in the order of description, they are connected with the undoubtedly northern *Angli,* &c.

It is safe, then, to say that the Langobard area was either discontinuous and interrupted, or else exceedingly sinuous and irregular in outline.

It is not so easy to account for this.

a. If it were certain that *b-rd=beard;* and—

b. If it were also certain that the length of *beard* was a characteristic of the Chatti, it would be fair to consider them as an intrusive, conquering, immigrant portion of that people—*i.e.,* High Germans within the Saxon area.

But as neither of these points is certain, the relations of the Langobards are uncertain also.

They may either be *intrusive* or *fragmentary.*

a. Intrusive.—If they be this, the population from which they originated may be either the High Germanic Chatti, or the Low German Sicambri.

b. Fragmentary.—If this, they may represent Saxons whose area has been encroached on.

They may be many other things besides.

The evidence of Tacitus makes them a *small* nation. Now there is the shade of an objection to this. Helmoldus (i. 26) mentions the *Bardi;* whilst in the neighbourhood of Lüneburg, so far north and east as even the Elbe, there is a district called *Barden*-gowe, and a town called *Barden*-wik.

Account for the element *Bard-* by supposing the Lango-*bards* to have given the name, and the nation becomes a large one; so large as to reach from *Engern* to *Lüneburg.* Good writers—perhaps the best—have done this. Yet the termination *-bard* alone, *minus* the prefix, scarcely seems to warrant the inference.

Far more important is the question as to the relation which the Langobards who conquered Italy, and gave their name to Lombardy, bore to these northern Langobards—the neighbours of the Angrivarii and Angli, but this is the subject of a separate notice.*

[2] *Reudigni.*]—See note in v. *Nuithones.* The same error which Tacitus is supposed to have made with the *Nuithones,* he is supposed to make with the *Reudigni.* He mistakes the first letter of their names. *Reudigni,* according to Zeuss, is for *Teut-igni,* or *Teutingi.* But these *Teutings* are not exactly the *Teut-ones,* but the *Teutonarii;* mentioned by Ptolemy as a different tribe—Μεταξὺ Σαξόνων δὲ καὶ τῶν Σουήβων Τευτονοάροι καὶ Οὐιροῦνοι, Φαροδεινῶν δὲ καὶ Σουήβων, Τεύτονες καὶ Αὔαρποι.

Of the three assumptions here, the last two are legitimate.

That the combination *-igni* is the patronymic or gentile form *-ing,* so that *Reudigni*=*Reudingi*=the *Reudings,* is highly probable.

That the patronymic form in *-ing,* can take the place of the termination *-wære* is shown by the forms *Kent-ing-as*=*men of Kent,* as compared with *Cant-ware*=*inhabitants of Kent.*

But the likelihood of Tacitus, who has hitherto given all his names in an unexceptionable form, blundering, when he begins to blunder, in two names out of six, is, to say the least, doubtful.

[3] *Aviones.*]—These are considered to be the *cutters;* their name being derived from the verb *hauan.* By the exact term *Aviones* they are not mentioned elsewhere. Ptolemy, however, has as one of the tribes of the Cimbric Chersonesus the Κοβανδοί. This name is identified with *Aviones* by two processes:—

1. Κοβανδ-, is the participle of the verb *hauan.*

* See *Epilegomena,* § *Langobards of Lombardy.*

2. The Κοβανδοί of Ptolemy=the Χαῦβοι of Strabo=the *Aviones* of Tacitus.

This, the identification of the Aviones with Κοβανδοί—not the derivation from *hauan*—is probable; the more so as one of the Greek forms of *Chamavi* is Χαμαβοί.

See *Epilegomena*, § *Obii.*

[4] *Angli.*]—See *Epilegomena*, §§ on the *Saxons*, on the *Angli*, and on the *Angli of Thuringia.*

[5] *Varini.*]—The probable locality of the Varini is the parts about Grabow and Warnow, on the river Eldene, an *eastern* feeder of the Elbe, and the course of the river Warnow.

This notice of the geographical relations of the Varini is important; since they supply some of our scanty *data* for the position of the Angle area, anterior to the respective migration of that important family.

The proposed locality assumes that the Varini of Tacitus occupied the same country as the *Warnabi*, *Warnavi*, or *Warnahi* of Adam of Bremen and certain writers of the twelfth century. A Mecklenburg charter of A.D. 1185, contains the following passage:—"Silva, quæ distinguit terras Havelliere, scilicet et Muritz, eandem terram quoque Muritz et Vepero cum terminis suis ad terram *Warnowe* ex utraque parte fluminis quod Eldene dicitur usque ad castrum Grabow."

Again, in a charter A.D. 1189:—"Distinguit tandem terram Möritz et Veprouwe cum omnibus terminis suis ad terram quæ *Warnowe* vocatur, includens et terram Warnouwwe cum terminis suis ex utraque parte fluminis quod Eldena dicitur, usque ad castrum quod Grabow nuncupatur."

This is the first mention we have of the Varini of Mecklenburg in the middle ages. For the semi-classical times, we have notices of *Warni* in Jornandes and Procopius.

But whether these *Warni* be the same as the *Varini*, is considered in *Epilegomena*, § *Varni.*

Were the Varini of Tacitus Germanic or Slavonic? The following facts are in favour of their being Germanic:—

1. The evidence of Tacitus.

2. Their worship (*if real*) of the same goddess as the *Angli** worshipped.

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Angli.*

In favour of a Slavonic affinity are :—

1. Their Slavonic character at the time they were first described from personal knowledge.

2. The absence of any traces of a previous Germanic population in the area occupied by them.

In other words, it is a certain fact that in the twelfth century the Warnavi were Slavonic, whilst the belief that the Varini were German, is a reasonable, but not unexceptionable, inference.

Probably, they were a frontier population.

[6] *Eudoses.*]—One of the tribes of the Cimbric Chersonese in Ptolemy's list, is that of the Φουνδούσιοι. Here Ptolemy is wrong and Tacitus right. *Eudoses* is the same word as Φουνδούσιοι, *minus* the Φ and ν. Such is Zeuss's view. To justify the first changes he quotes the similar (supposed) mistake, on the part of Ptolemy, in the word Φαρόδεινοι. See note on *Suardones.*

The second is defended—and that reasonably—by the forms Βουντοῦνται, Βρινξάνται, Κέντιον ὄρος, and Βαινοχαῖμαι; in all of which the ν is, undoubtedly, an improper interfix.

See *Epilegomena*, § *Phundusii.*

[7] *Suardones.*]—See note on Eudoses.

This word is considered by Zeuss to be derived from the Mœso-Gothic *svaird*, Anglo-Saxon *sweord=sword*, just as *Saxon* from *sahs =knife.* Hence, Tacitus's name is the correct one. On the other hand Ptolemy places *after the Saxons, and on the river Chalusus* (μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Σάξονας ἀπὸ τοῦ Χαλούσου ποταμοῦ) the *Pharodini* (Φαροδεινοί).

Now the Φαροδ- of Φαροδεινοί, is, according to Zeuss, the *Suard-* of *Suardones.* I am not prepared either to deny or affirm this.

[8] *Nuithones.*]—Zeuss's reasoning upon this word is remarkable, but unsatisfactory. By an elaborate series of combinations he derives his own name from it. He assumes :—

1. That by the *Nuithones* Tacitus means the *Teutones*, the *t* being changed into *n*. "Aus Deutschland selbst geben Plinius und Ptolemæus noch die formen *Teutoni*, *Teutones*, aber auch schon Tacitus *Nuithones* (=*Niuthones*) mit den wurzelhaftem *n*, wie Nerthus."

2. That *Ciuuari*,* a remarkable, and hitherto unexplained, form in a document called the Wessobrunner Manuscript, is the same as

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Ciuuari.*

Ziuvari; of which the second element is the word *ware=inhabitants,* and the first the root *Teut-*, with the first *t* changed, and the latter ejected. Of these three changes it is only the second that is, etymologically, objectionable. The decomposition of the word into *-ware* +a prefixed noun is almost certainly correct. The change from *t* to *z* is nothing more than what the difference between a High German and Low German form leads us to expect. The ejection of the second *t*, and the connection thereby effected with the root *Teut-* is illegitimate.

3. That the Old High German proper names *Zuto, Zuzo,* and *Zuzzo* and the Frisian form *Tuta* are the same as *Teut-* in *Teuton.*

4. That *Zuzzo=Zuzo=Zuto=Tuta=Teut-* in *Teuton=Nuith-* in *Nuithones=Zeuss*:—"Und dann ist auch der familienname *Zeuss* in neuer form der alte name?" When a man is investigating the etymology of his own name we must allow him more than usual latitude.

[9] *Herthum.*]—Another reading is *Nerthum,* and that in good MSS.

Nevertheless, the probability of a form in *h* being preferable is so great, as, perhaps, to justify us in assuming it to be the right one.

The words *Terram matrem,* when compared with our own word *earth,* the Anglo-Saxon *eorþe,* the Old High German *erdu,* the Mœso-Gothic *airthus* almost force upon us the reading *Herthum.*

As cautions, however, against disposing of the *N* thus summarily, we have the following facts:—

1. The fact of there being no *H* in any of the German equivalents to *Terra.*

2. The fact of there being in the Eddaic mythology a deity named *Niördr.*

And against the conclusion that, even if the reading be *h,* the goddess must necessarily be *Hertha=Earth,* is the existence of an Anglo-Saxon deity *Hreþe,* with different attributes.

Still I think *Terra Mater=Mother Earth.*

[10] *Insulâ.*]—Heligoland.

[11] *Oceani.*]—The German Ocean. The name *Helig-ö=holy isle* favours this view.

The term *Oceani* does the same. Nevertheless, it is applied to the Baltic also.

So does the undoubted Germanic occupancy of the island.

So do its relations to the Elbe and Weser.

At the same time claims have been asserted for the Isle of Rugen in the Baltic.

Rugen is full of sacred antiquities; and, at the beginning of the historical period, was, perhaps, more unequivocally a *Holy Island* than *Heligoland*, in fact, though not in name.

But at the beginning of the historical period, the rites, creed, and population were *Slavonic*.

Of course, by considering the *Rugii* of § 43 as Germanic, this objection is neutralized.

But I more than doubt whether this can be done.

As to the *Reudigni*, *Aviones*, *Angli*, *Varini*, *Eudoses*, *Suardones*, and *Nuithones*, collectively, we must remember, that, at the beginning of the historical period, the Slavonians of the Lower Elbe are found so far westwards as to make it doubtful whether the German frontier —the Northern Germano-Slavonic March—can be carried much farther eastward than the Hartz.

Lauenburg, was the occupancy of the *Polabi*, a remarkable name. *Po*=*on* and *Laba*=*Albis*= the *Elbe*, the Slavonic form of that name. Hence the *Polabi* were to the Elbe as the *Po-mo-rani* of Pomerania to the sea (*po*=*on*, and *more*=*sea*). Slavonic as this form was, it was adopted by the Germans; and became a hybrid word by means of the affix *-ing* —Po-lab-*ingi*, a word half German and half Slavonic in form, but wholly Slavonic in power.

Eastern Holstein was *Wagrian;* Aldenburg being the capital of the Slavonic Wagri.—" Henricus . . intravit Slaviam, percussit . . *omnem terram Plunensem*, *Luthilenburgensem*, *Aldenburgensem*, *omnemque regionem*, *quæ inchoat a rivo Sualen et clauditur mari Baltico et flumine Trabena.*"—Helmold. i. 56.

Mecklenburg was the country of the Obotriti; *Luneburg* of the *Linones*, whose Slavonic tongue was extant till A.D. 1700. The details of the Slavonians of *Alt-mark* are obscure, but as it is certain that Luchow and Danneberg in the north were Slavonic, and that southwards there were numerous Slavonians in the direction of Saxony, we may, *provisionally*, consider that a line drawn from Hamburg to Jena represents the *Old* Slavono-Germanic March, in its oldest form. Afterwards, the Saale forms the boundary.

That the Varini were Slavonic is only *likely*. That the *Angli* were German is *certain*. Hence—

The *Eudoses*, &c., come in with the latter rather than the former, and, on the ground of being what the Angli were, are Germanic.

Such being the case, it is necessary to place their locality in the direction of Holstein and Sleswick northwards rather than in that of Luneburg and Mecklenburg to the north-*east;* since the former is the direction of the German, the latter that of the *Slavonic* populations.

It is also necessary to place them on the North Sea rather than the Baltic, on account of *Heligoland.*

Hence, the majority of the tribes in question were probably the ancient occupants of the *western* parts (the eastern being Slavonic) of Sleswick-Holstein; a population divided between the Anglo-Saxon and the North-Frisian sections, and a population more or less represented by the Nordalbingians of the eighth century.

Saxonum populus quidam, quos claudit ab austro
Albia sejunctim positos aquilonis ad axem.

Poëta Saxo, ad an. 798.

"Est enim gens in partibus nostri regni *Saxonum scilicet et Fresonum commixta,* in confinibus Nordmannorum et Obodritorum sita."—Ruodolfi Fuldens. Transl. S. Alexandri, Pertz ii. 677.

In the way of a more minute geography, these Nordalbingians were the people of Sturmar, Holstein, and Ditmarsh.—"Thiedmarsi, Holtsati, Sturmarii: transalbianorum Saxonum tres sunt populi: primi ad Oceanum *Thiatmarsgoi* (al. *Thiedmarsi*), et eorum ecclesia Mildiuthorp (al. Melindorp); secundi *Holtzati,* dicti a silvis, quas incolunt, eos Sturia flumen interfluit, quorum ecclesia Sconenfeld; tertii, qui et nobiliores, *Sturmarii* dicuntur, eo quod seditionibus illa gens frequenter agitur. Inter quos metropolis Hammaburg caput extollit."—Adam. Brem. Hist. Eccl. c. 61. "Habet utique Hammenburgensis ecclesia præscriptos terminos suæ parochiæ, ultimam scilicet partem Saxoniæ, quæ est trans Albiam et dicitur Nordalbingia, continens tres populos, *Tethmarsos, Holsatos, Stormarios.*"—Helmold. Chron. Slavor. i. 6. "Attritæ sunt vires Saxonum, et servierunt Cruconi sub tributo, omnis terra videlicet Nordalbingorum, quæ disterminatur in tres populos: *Holzatos, Sturmarios, Thetmarchos.*"—Id. i. 26.

The river Bille divided these from the Slavonians of Lauenburg.

As *Nordalbingi* is a term denoting an attribute (*i.e.*, geographical position); and *Sturmar, Ditmarsh,* and *Holstein* geographical

terms, there is no difficulty in supposing that some of the names of the present text represent the ancestors of the *Anglo*-Saxons of Britain; in other words, that they stood in the same relation to that section of the Germanic population as the *Fosi* and other minor nations grouped around the Cherusci, did to the Old Saxons.

Still the distribution of the North Frisians complicates the view. See *Epilegomena*, § *Angli*.

XLI. Et hæc quidem pars Suevorum in secretiora Germaniæ porrigitur. Propior (ut quo modo paullo antè Rhenum, sic nunc Danubium sequar) Hermundurorum civitas,[1] fida Romanis, eóque solis Germanorum non in ripâ commercium, sed penitus, atque in splendidissimâ Rhætiæ provinciæ coloniâ: passim et sine custode transeunt; et cùm ceteris gentibus arma modò castraque nostra ostendamus, his domos, villasque patefecimus, non concupiscentibus. In Hermunduris Albis oritur,[2] flumen inclitum et notum olim; nunc tantùm auditur.

NOTES ON SECTION XLI.

[1] *Hermundurorum civitas.*]—See pp. 66 and 149.

[2] *In Hermunduris Albis oritur.*]—Let us consider what means the contemporaries of Tacitus had of knowing the source of the true Elbe; lying as they do within the unknown country of Bohemia. I say *unknown* because there were certainly few means of knowing it. Indeed, even at present it is by no means easy to say which of three rivers is the true Elbe—the river which runs by Pilsen on the west, the river which runs by Colin on the east, or the Muldau from the south: besides which, it is equally difficult to say which of the numerous feeders of these streams leads us to the true source.

This makes it probable that the *Albis* to which Tacitus assigns the country of the Hermunduri was the *Saale;* a view which gives us the parts about *Hof* as portions of the area of the Hermunduri.

An additional reason for believing that, in the eyes of a German, the source of the *Saale* was the source of the *Elbe*, is to be found in the name of the latter river itself. The name *Elv=river;* the Scandinavian equivalent to the German *Fluss*—a fact which shows either that the Frisian of the Lower Elbe was spoken in a form approaching the Norse, or else that the Norse itself was then spoken farther southwards than afterwards — "*Albis* fluvius oritur in prædictis Alpibus, perque medios Gothorum populos currit in Oceanum, inde et Goth*elba* dicitur."—De Sit. Daniæ, c. 229. This applies to the *Swedish* river *Gotaelf.*

Now as the name was German, and as it was given by the population of the lower part of the river, it is more likely that it was extended upwards to a *German* branch, like the Saale, than to a *Slavonic* one, like that which rises in Bohemia.

As Tacitus is now beginning with the Danube, up to which he brings the Hermunduri, the source of the Elbe must be in the more northern parts of the area of that population; but as he also separates the Hermunduri from the Suevi, we must be careful against carrying the frontier too far in that direction.

XLII. Juxta Hermunduros[1] Narisci,[2] ac deinde Marcomanni[3] et Quadi[4] agunt. Præcipua Marcomannorum gloria viresque, atque ipsa etiam sedes, pulsis olim Boiis, virtute parta. Nec Narisci Quadive degenerant. Eaque Germaniæ velut frons est, quatenus Danubio pergitur. Marcomannis, Quadisque usque ad nostram memoriam reges manserunt, ex gente ipsorum, nobile Marobodui et Tudri genus: jam et externos patiuntur. Sed vis et potentia regibus, ex auctoritate Romanâ: rarò armis nostris, sæpius pecuniâ juvantur.

NOTES ON SECTION XLII.

[1] *Hermunduros.*]—The reasons for considering the name *Hermunduri* a compound word, are numerous and satisfactory.

For the opinions as to the meaning of the term *Hermun*, see pp. 47—49.

The root *dur-* re-appears in the Τευρ-ιο-χαῖμαι of Ptolemy; a compound of *Teur-* and *heim*=*home;* just as *Boio-hemum*=*the home of the Boii.* All this is pointed out by Zeuss, who expressly says that *Hermun-duri* is evidently a compound (*augenscheinlich compositum*) and also that the Τευριοχαῖμαι of Ptolemy means the same people.

The identification of both forms with the modern form *Thuringen* (*Thur-ingia*), is equally probable. The *-ing* is the gentile or patronymic affix—consequently no part of the original word.

The change from *d* to *t*, which occurs between Tacitus and Ptolemy, occurs in the more modern forms also; *Durinc*,=*Tur-ing*, being the Old High German word.

This justifies us in considering the population, whose name appears as the second element of the word Hermun-*duri*, as the occupants of the parts between the Werra and the Saale; or the present district of Thuringia, wherein we find a *Tor-gau*.

All this is confirmed by the following observations of Zeuss. After the Marcomannic war, in which they took part, the Hermun-*duri* disappear. Suevia, which, in the Roman maps, fills up the country between the Bructeri and Alemanni, in its eastern parts, represents their country. Jornandes, who mentions them but once, does so in a loose and general way, and evidently on the authority of older writers. Speaking of the Vandals of the first half of the fourth century, he says—"Erant namque illis tunc ab oriente Gothi, ab occidente Marcomanni, a septentrione *Hermunduri*, a meridie Hister, qui et Danubius dicitur."—C. 22. From this time forwards, history knows no Hermunduri, but, from the fifth century downwards, *Toringi*, *Thoringi*, and *Thuringi*, in their stead. That the Thuringians are in nowise a different people from the early Hermun-*duri*, can be safely admitted, since we discover neither how so considerable a population as the latter, should have been lost, nor whence such a one as the former could have originated. Besides which, the later writers always place the Thuringians at the back of the Franks and Alemanni, and between them and the Saxons; this being the original country of the Hermun-duri.

Upon the locality of the *Hermundorum civitas*, I can throw no light.

The extent given in the text to the area of the Hermunduri requires notice. Tacitus brings them as far south as the Danube.

This is much beyond the limits of the present Thuringia. More than this, it is beyond the Τευριοχαῖμαι of Ptolemy. Nevertheless, for reasons given in the *Epilegomena*, I think the extension highly probable.

If so, the country of the Hermun-*duri* was the greater part of Thuringia, *plus* the valley of the Naab.

The complement to this note are *Epilegomena*, § *Ostrogoths*, and the next note.

[2] *Narisci.*]—The Fichtelgebirge, in its western extension, is the water-shed to the Saale and the Naab—north and south; the Saale belonging to the system of the Elbe, the Naab to that of the Danube. Along with the valley of the Naab, that of the Regen should be considered; the Regen being the stream nearest the mountain-frontier of Bohemia.

The present names of the geographical localities for the system of these two rivers, are almost wholly German—*almost*, but not quite. Slavonic forms appear occasionally, increasing slightly as we approach Bohemia.

The German dialect, to which the German names of geographical localities (as far as it is not an over-refinement to refer them to one dialect more than another) are mostly referable, is the High German of Bavaria.

Slavonic names occur even west of the Naab; though rarely.

Putting all this together, I infer—

a. From the existence of Slavonic names *at all*, an early Slavonic occupancy.

b. From the paucity of them, an *early* displacement of such occupants.

c. From the forms in *p*, the Alemannic origin of the *last* invaders. Mark the word *last*.

For accomplishing the change from Slavonic to German, the date of the chief Alemannic conquests is full early enough.

But it by no means follows that, because Germans of the Alemannic type conquered a country, originally Slavonic, in the third, fourth, or fifth centuries, they must have been the *first* Germans who did so. Earlier encroachers upon the Slavonians of the Naab and Regen may have proceeded from the parts to the north—from Thuringia. A Hermunduric conquest in the *first*, is perfectly compatible with an Alemannic in the *fifth* century.

I believe such to have been the case. The previous occupancy of the valley of the Naab (at least) by Germans anterior to the invasion of the present Bavarians, is necessary to account for their presence on the Danube, in the second, third, and fourth centuries: besides which the present text requires it.

The present text also requires that they should be either Hermunduri, or closely allied to them.

The reasons for believing the Hermunduri to have belonged to a different section of the Germans (indeed to have been the chief branch of the Mœso-Goths) will be found in the sequel.*

Whether the *Narisci* were Slavonians like their neighbours on the east, or Germans like their neighbours on the south, is, notwithstanding the text, an open question.

As *Narisci*, we have no further specific ethnological information about them.

If, however, we allow the Οὐαριστοί of Ptolemy to be the same people, we get a second notice of them; a notice, however, which adds nothing to our knowledge; merely doing what is done by Tacitus, *i.e.*, placing them next to the Hermunduri (Τευριοχαῖμαι).

To get any new facts, we must go further still. Let the word *Warasci*=Οὐαριστοί=*Narisci*.

For the French districts of Jura and Doubs, on the banks of the river from which the latter takes its name, we have the following notice:—"Eustasius ad Luxovium regressus est. Deinde ad *Warascos*, qui partem Sequanorum provinciæ et Duvii amnis fluenta ex utraque ripa incolunt, pergit."—*Vita S. Salabergæ.*

This speaks only to the *people*. The following, however, goes further, and gives us the hypothesis as to their origin:—"Pergit (*sc.* Eustasius) progrediens *Warescos* ad fidem Domini nostri Jesu Christi convertit, qui olim de pago, qui dicitur *Stadevanga*, qui situs est circa Regnum flumen, partibus Orientis fuerant ejecti, quique contra Burgundiones pugnam inierunt, sed a primo certamine terga vertentes, dehinc advenerunt, atque in pugnam reversi, victores quoque effecti, in eodem pago Warescorum consederunt."—Vita S. Ermenfredi.

There is nothing improbable in this; the river *Regnum* being considered the *Regen*. I have not, however, been more successful than Zeuss in finding such a name as *Stadevanga* on any of the maps.

* *Epilegomena*, § *Ostrogoths.*

The nearest approach to it is a compound of *-vang* on the Bavarian and Wurtemburg frontier.

A shade of evidence in favour of the original *Narisci* having been Slavonic, is to be got from the confusion between the form in *-sc-* and that in *-st-; the identity being granted.*

A *Sclavonic* affinity would best account for this; since, such a form might end in *-ritsh* (*Naritsh*), a syllable which contains *both* the *t* out of which *-st-*, and the *sh* out of which *-sc-* might be developed. Nay! such an ending as even *-ishtsh* would be nothing unusual in Slavonic. No German form exists which gives us an equally probable origin of the two forms. In that language it would be either *-isk* to the exclusion of the sound of *t*, or *ist* to the exclusion of that of *k*; neither of which would be sufficiently strange to a Roman or Greek ear to be mistaken for the other, or, indeed, for anything else. Very different, however, would be the case with the complex Slavonic sibilants.

A sound like the *ch* in *chest* (*tsh*), was a strange sound to the countrymen both of Tacitus and Ptolemy; and (more than this) it was just the sound which one writer might represent by *-sk*, and another by *-st*.

Their position as colonists in Burgundy is compatible with either affinity: though, perhaps, it favours the German.

Dion's notice of the *Naristæ* is—Καὶ οἱ Ναρισταὶ ταλαιπωρησάντες τρισχίλιοι ἅμα ηὐτομόλησαν, καὶ γῆν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἔλαβον.—Lib. lxxi.

As τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ may apply to any portion of Roman Gaul, this passage may give us the origin of the *Warasci.*

Again—as a mere guess, I suggest the probability of their representing some of those intrusive members of the kingdom of Ariovistus who appropriated a third of the land of the Sequani, as related by Cæsar.

[3] *Marcomanni.*]—The remarks of *Prol.* xvii. are the necessary preliminaries to this note: indeed, to a certain extent they stand in place of it.

The *Marc-o-manni* in question were those of the Tshekh or Bohemian March, and, I imagine, they extended from the valley of the Naab to Lower Austria; their area following the line of the mountains that enclose the south, and south-west parts of Bohemia. To the *foot* of these the *Marc-o-manni* were probably limited; since,

the mountain-fastnesses themselves were probably the residence of Slavonians.

I do not imagine that there was a *second* March in this quarter, *i.e.*, one on the Roman (Rhætian, Vindelician, or Rhæto-Vindelician) frontier. The Danube served instead.

Of course all this has the value of presumptive reasoning—no more.

[4] *Quadi.*]—The area of the Quadi seems nearly to have reached as far south as the present province of Lower Austria. This brings them to the Danube, as the text of Tacitus requires—"*Eaque Germaniæ velut frons est, quatenus Danubio pergitur.*" At the same time, the line of the Germanic March must have been irregular, and the Germanic area north of the Danube narrow. It must also have extended as far northwards as Moravia and Upper Hungary.

Up to the time of Tacitus, the political relations of the Quadi are chiefly with the confederacies of Maroboduus,* Catvalda, and the *Regnum Vannianum.*

Afterwards they are chiefly with the Sarmatians of Hungary.

I know no reasons, except a statement of Ammianus as to their arms being like those of the *Sarmatæ*, and the likelihood of the name *Vannius* (*gentis Quadorum*) of the *Regnum Vannianum* being the Slavonic title *Pan=Dominus*, for making them Sarmatian rather than German. But these I think sufficient. Still, as they are a frontier population, the remark that applies to the *Marsigni* applies to the *Quadi* also.

XLIII. Nec minùs valent retro Marsigni,[1] Gothini,[2] Osi,[3] Burii:[4] terga Marcomannorum, Quadorumque claudunt: e quibus Marsigni, et Burii sermone cultuque Suevos referunt. Gothinos Gallica, Osos Pannonica lingua coarguit, non esse Germanos; et quòd tributa patiuntur: partem tributorum Sarmatæ, partem Quadi, ut alienigenis, imponunt: Gothini, quò magis pudeat, et ferrum effodiunt: omnesque hi populi pauca campestrium, ceterùm saltus et vertices montium jugumque insederunt. Dirimit enim scin-

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Quasi-Germanic Gauls*, ad fin.

ditque Sueviam continuum montium jugum, ultra quod plurimæ gentes agunt: ex quibus latissimè patet Lygiorum[5] nomen in plures civitates diffusum. Valentissimas nominasse sufficiet, Arios,[6] Helveconas,[7] Manimos, Elysios, Naharvalos.[8] Apud Naharvalos antiquæ religionis lucus ostenditur. Præsidet sacerdos muliebri ornatu:[9] sed "deos, interpretatione Romanâ,[10] Castorem Pollucemque"[11] memorant. Ea vis numini: nomen *Alcis:*[12] nulla simulacra, nullum peregrinæ superstitionis vestigium: ut fratres tamen, ut juvenes venerantur. Ceterùm Arii super vires, quibus enumeratos paullo antè populos antecedunt, truces, insitæ feritati arte ac tempore lenocinantur: nigra scuta, tincta corpora: atras ad prœlia noctes legunt: ipsâque formidine atque umbrâ feralis exercitûs terrorem inferunt, nullo hostium sustinente novum ac velut infernum aspectum: nam primi in omnibus prœliis oculi vincuntur. Trans Lygios Gothones[13] regnantur, paullo jam adductiùs, quàm ceteræ Germanorum gentes, nondum tamen supra libertatem. Protinus deinde ab Oceano Rugii,[14] et Lemovii:[15] omniumque harum gentium insigne, rotunda scuta, breves gladii, et erga reges obsequium.

NOTES ON SECTION XLIII.

[1] *Marsigni.*]—This is, almost certainly, the Roman mode of spelling *Mars-ing-i.* Why it should be so is difficult to say. The combinations *ping-o, ling-o-,* &c., are Latin. Perhaps, the Greek mode of expressing *-ng-* by γγ may have determined the use of the *g.*

The name itself is, probably, German=the *Mars-ings.*

What does *Mars-* mean? Not *March;* since they are distinguished from the *Marco-manni.*

Perhaps *Marsh.* The country, however, is more mountainous than marshy.

Perhaps the river *Maros*. It is not necessary, however, that it should have any ascertained meaning.

I take the words "*Marsigni sermone cultuque Suevos referunt*" as they stand.

It is against the principles laid down in a previous part of the work to lightly admit as Germanic any nation placed, like the Marsigni (*terga Marcomannorum—claudunt*) beyond the *March*.

But it is also against other principles to treat a definite assertion of an author like Tacitus summarily.

We must, also, take the word *Suevus* as he understood it, *i.e.*, as meaning *German*—not as his present commentator does, *i.e.*, as meaning *Slavonic*.

Hence, there are no *great* objections against the *Marsigni* being considered German—or, rather, as they are a frontier population, and, consequently, involving no serious error either one way or the other, there is no need for an over-scrutinizing criticism.

The same applied to the Quadi and Narisci.

[2] *Gothini.*]—The *-n-* here is almost certainly of the same inflexional or non-radical character with the *-n-* in Goth-*ones*; and the same criticism, in other respects, applies to it.—See note in v. *Gothones*.

In Ptolemy we find that beyond the Βαινοχαῖμαι (Bavarians) were the Batini.—Ὑπὲρ οὖς (Βαινοχαίμους) Βατεινοὶ, καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους, ὑπὸ τὸ Ἀσκιβούργιον ὄρος Κορκοντοὶ, καὶ Λούγιοι οἱ Βοῦροι, μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Οὐιστούλα ποταμοῦ. Ὑπὸ δὲ τούτους, πρῶτοι Σίδωνες, εἶτα Κόγνοι, εἶτα Οὐϊσβούργιοι, ὑπὲρ τὸν Ὀρκύνιον δρυμόν. Now Zeuss considers that Κόγνοι is a fault in the MSS. for Κότνοι, which is likely enough. He also thinks that the Κότνοι are the Κότινοι of Dion Cassius, and that the Κότινοι of Dion Cassius are the Gothini of Tacitus—which is likely too.

The iron-mines, combined with the statement as to their language, fix the Gothini in the Gallician Carpathians.

Gallica—lingua.—I know no reasons for believing that the name *Halitsch*, the Slavonic form for *Gallicia* is one whit less ancient than the names *Gallia*, *Britannia*, *Italia*, *Hellas*, &c.

Until I do, I translate *Gallica* by *Gallician*; considering that the same similarity, with the same likelihood of creating error, between words as like as the form out of which *Gallicia* grew, and that out of which the Romans formed *Galli* and the Greeks Γαλάται, existed in the time of Tacitus as now.

[3] *Osi.*]—No other writer but Tacitus *unequivocally* mentions any tribe with a name like that of *Osi*, in the neighbourhood of the south-eastern March. The *Osii* of Ptolemy are too far north to coincide with them. These are a people beyond the Veltæ (Οὐέλται), a Lithuanic nation on the Baltic—*Πάλιν δὲ τὴν μὲν ἐφεξῆς τῷ Οὐενεδικῷ κόλπῳ παρωκεανῖτιν κατέχουσιν* Οὐέλται, *ὑπὲρ οὓς* Ὄσιοι, *εἶτα* Κάρϐωνες *ἀρκτικώτατοι*; a people whose name Zeuss is probably right in connecting with that of the island *Osilia*=*Oezel.*—P. 272.

I say that no writer but Tacitus *unequivocally* mentions any tribe with a name like that of the Osi, in the neighbourhood of the south-eastern March; and I now draw attention to the qualifying word *unequivocally.* What if the Οὐϊσϐούργιοι be the people of Οὐϊσϐουργ-, as they almost certainly were, and Οὐϊσϐουργ- be the *burg* or *berg* of the Osi?

Whether the -*βουργ*- in Οὐϊσϐούργιοι=*berg*=*hill*, or *burgh*=*borough*, *i.e.*, whether the compound be a word like Konings-*berg*, or a word like Ham-*burg*, is of no great consequence. The word is a German one. Yet it by no means follows that the nation it designated was German.

Wisburg (or *Wisberg*) might be a German name for a Slavonic locality, just as *Liefland* (*Livonia*) and *Courland* are.

It might also (as suggested in p. 97), in the hands of a Greek writer, take the form *Asciburgius Mons.*

That the *Osi* were *not* German is Tacitus's own statement.

The complement to this note is not. in vv. *Aravisci ab Osis—Osi ab Araviscis*, p. 96, &c.

The hypothesis is as follows:—

a. That the population from the *Asciburgius Mons*, or the Carpathians between Gallicia, Moravia, and Upper Hungary, was once continuous with that of Croatia; the northern portion of it being called, by the Germans, *Osi.*

b. The invasion of the Germans of the Danube broke up this continuity.

c. But not wholly. Within the German area (probably in the mountain strongholds of the *Luna Silva*=*Jablunka Berg*), isolated portions of the Osi preserved their language.

[4] *Burii.*]—What applies to the Marsigni applies to the *Burii.* They may be considered German as long as there is no stronger objection lying against them than their situation beyond the March,

and as long as that objection is met by the special statement that their tongue was *Suevic*, *i.e.*, in the eyes of Tacitus, *German*.

But there is a stronger objection. It will be seen in the next note that Ptolemy places them in the same category with the *Lygii*.

[5] *Lygiorum.*]—Here, according to Tacitus, we have a generic term like *Gallus* and *Suevus*.

Neither is there any reason to doubt his evidence. On the contrary it is confirmed in more quarters than one.

1. Ptolemy gives the same generic power to the word—Ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς Βουγοῦντας Λούγιοι οἱ Ὀμανοὶ, ὑφ' οὓς Λούγιοι οἱ Δοῦνοι, μέχρι τοῦ Ἀσκιβυργίου ὄρους .... καὶ Λούγιοι οἱ Βοῦροι, μέχρι τοῦ Οὐιστούλα ποταμοῦ.

2. The extract from Nestor * confirms Ptolemy:—"When the Wallachians attacked the Slovenians—the Slovenians went forth, and settled on the River Vislje (Vistula), and called themselves Lekhs (*Ljachove*). And some of these people were called *Poles*, some Luticzi, some Pomoranians."

This does something more than confirm Ptolemy. It shows that the root *Lekh* was Slavonic, *i.e.*, the native name by which the Slavonians of the Vistula called themselves, rather than the name by which they were called by their *non*-Slavonic neighbours.

That the name of *Lekh* was recognised by other writers than Nestor, indeed, that it was a common designation, is shown by the hypothesis of the later chronicles, where it becomes the name of the *eponymus* of the *Poles*. Tshekh and Lekh are the two leaders of two great nations; the first of the Poles, the second of the Bohemians. Of the latter, the *present* native name is *Tshekh*; of the former, *Lekh* was the *original* denomination.

Hence the name *Lekh* in Nestor's time, at least, was *native*.

After this, does any reader doubt the identity between the Lygii of Tacitus and the Poles? or, admitting this, does he believe the *Lygii* to have been German?

Amongst ethnologists, Zeuss, for one, insists on this latter view.

I confess that it strikes me unfavourably that he has kept back the identity of locality, combined with the similarity of sound between the *Lekh* of Nestor, and the *Lygii* of Tacitus. Whether we look to his remarks on the former word (p. 126), or the latter (p.

* *Prolegomena*, p. xxiii.

662), we find abundant signs of readiness to associate similar words with the one under consideration. Thus (in vv. *Poloni*, *Wenden*) he expends some ingenuity in showing the probability of the Lekh of Nestor, and the Λενζανῆνοι of Constantine Porphyrogenita being identical. He also shows some research in tracing the names in the Icelandic writings of Snorro (as *Læsjar*) and in the Latin of Witikind (*Liciaviki*).

Then in v. *Lygii* he enumerates the slightly varied forms *Ligii*, *Lugii*, Λοῖοι, Λούγιοι, *Lug*iones, Λογίωνες, *Lup*iones, and hints at an etymological connection with the root *long*. But, with all this there is not a single reference from *Lygii* to *Lekh*, nor yet any from *Lekh* to *Lygii;* so that the very important fact of similarity of name coinciding with identity of area, is not even recognised as a complication worth investigating.

Pole is a geographical, rather than a national, term, and means *occupants of plains*. *Pole*=*plain*, and *Polak*=*an inhabitant of a plain*. Of this *Polacy* is the plural form. Nestor writing in Old Slavonic, has the form *Poljane*. Hence the Latin form *Polonia*—"Inter Alpes Hunniæ et Oceanum est *Polonia*, sic dicta in eorum idiomate quasi *Campania*."—Zeuss, p. 662.

The *d* in the English form *Poland*, has been introduced by the same process of confusion which converts *asparagus* into *sparrow-grass*, *i.e.*, the tendency to identify a *like* term in a foreign, with some real one in the native tongue.

The situation of the Lygii of Tacitus is that of the *Lekhs* of Nestor.

The present Poles are the Lekhs of Nestor under another name. This is admitted by Zeuss.—"The name *Lech*, originally a general name given by the eastern to the western branch of Slavonians, must most frequently have been applied to those who lived nearest, *viz.*, the Poles. At length, after ceasing to be a general appellation, it became fixed as their special designation."—P. 662.

With all this, not a word about *Lekh* being even like *Lyg-ii*.

But it may be said that the assumption of a migration in the case of the Slavonic Lekhs is legitimate, inasmuch as it is suggested by the very passage of Nestor lately quoted.

Be it so. There would still stand over the very remarkable fact that the very area in which these immigrant *Lekhs* settled, should be an area occupied by a people with a name almost identical with their own. What should we say to a writer who argued that Boston

in the United States was, very likely, wholly unconnected with Boston in England; that it was an aboriginal American name; that by mere chance, the Bostonians of Lincolnshire fell in with a place named like their native town; and that by mere chance the aboriginal Bostonians of Massachusetts were displaced by a population bearing the same name as themselves?

But they might have taken their name from that of the earlier *Lygii*. Not so. The tradition about the eponymus *Lech* is strong evidence in favour of its being native. What Anglo-Saxon ever called himself a descendant of *Brut*; or placed *Brut* at the head of his genealogy?

[6] *Arii—Manimi—Elysii.*]—I can throw no light on these names, unless the *Man-imi* be the *Lygii O-man-i* of Ptolemy.

[7] *Helveconas.*]—'Ρουτικλείων δὲ καὶ Βουγούντων (μεταξὺ κεῖνται) Αἰλουαίωνες.—Ptolemy. They, probably, are part of the duchy of Posen; possibly Slavonians of the river *Hevel*.

[8] *Naharvalos.*]—To what appears in the text I can add but little about the Naharvali.

The termination *-val* has been considered Germanic, *i.e.*, = the *-phal* in *West-phal-ia*, and other similar compounds.

It is not, however, exclusively so. A form so near it as *gal* is Lithuanic, and, perhaps, Slavonic as well.—"*Letti*, qui proprie dicuntur *Let-gall-i*.—Letti vel *Lett-gall-i* adhuc pagani." This is from Henry the Lett, speaking of the Letts of Livonia. Nestor, a *Russian*, has the form Sjet-gola.

Again—the old inhabitants of part of Samogitia are not only *Samo-gitæ*, but *Sem-i-gall-i*, *San-gal-i*, and *Sam-gal-i*, in the older Latin writers, and *Zim-gola* in Nestor.

Again—"Swiatha (sc. fluvius) ex Samogitia, cujus fons prope Vilkomiriam et in villa Remy-*gola*, ostia circa Mariewerder, et hic dividit Lithuaniam et Samogitiam."—Dlugoss.

Is it safe then to say that such internal evidence as is derived from the element *-val* in favour of the Nahar-*vali* being German is neutralized by the Lithuanic terminations. The meaning of the word is uncertain. All that is certain is, that the word is a compound.

Victo-*hali* (Victo-*ali*, Victo-*vali*), and Thai-*phali*, seem to be

similar compounds. These are the names of populations on the Lower Danube—German in the eyes of most writers, Slavonic in those of the present.

For further notice of the *Naharvali*, see remarks on the *Nadrovitæ*, p. 173.

9 *Muliebri ornatu.*]—Adam of Bremen describes the priests of the ancient Courlanders, not indeed as dressing as *women*, but as *monks*. "Divinis, auguribus, atque necromanticis omnes domus sunt plenæ, qui etiam *vestitu monachico* induti sunt."—De Situ Daniæ, c. 223.

10 *Interpretatione Romanâ.*]—The commentary upon the principles which determine the choice of a given deity in one country as the equivalent, parallel, or analogue to one in another, would be one of great length. They are, however, referable to two heads:—

1. The correspondence may be suggested by similarity of *name;* or—

2. The correspondence may be suggested by similarity of *attributes*.

If what is written on the names Hercules, Isis, &c., be correct, we have instances of both principles in Tacitus.

a. *Isis* (see note in *vocem*) seems determined by the former process.

b. *Hercules* by the latter.

c. For *Mars*, *Mercury*, and *Pollux*, a case may be made out either way.

11 *Castorem Pollucemque.*]—The Slavonic mythology has two associated gods, named *Lel* and *Polel*.

Without being able to say that, beyond their duality, and the name of one of them, there is anything to connect them with the Castor and *Pollux* of Tacitus, I am not afraid of saying that the *German* mythology has nothing equally similar, be this similarity little or much.

12 *Alcis.*]—I believe this *alc-* to be simply Lithuanic.

Hartknoch, in his Dissertatio de Diis Prussorum minoribus, writes, "Inter *feras* Prussi veteres in primis *alcem* (the *elk*) divino prosequebantur honore, ut testis est Erasmus Stella, in Lib. ii. Antiq. Boruss. Nec dubium est quin *aliis* quoque *animalibus* divini honores sint delati."—§ 7.

The fact of a thing or person named *Alc-* being an object of

worship to the Lithuanians is an unexceptionable inference from this passage. Its identity with the quadruped *elk* is, probably, a misapprehension of the author's.

[13] *Gothones.*]—Reasons for considering the Gothones to be Æstii under a Slavonic name, will be found in not. ad v. *Æstii.*

The *-n* is, almost certainly, an inflexional element rather than a part of the root.

It may be German, *i.e.*, the *-n* in *East-an* and other similar weak forms.

But it may also be Slavonic, *i.e.*, the *-n*, in such forms as *Poljane*, &c.

That the radical part (*Goth-*) is Slavonic, is in the highest degree probable.

But for this *vid. infr.* in v. *Æstii*, and *Epilegomena*, § *Goths.*

[14] *Rugii.*]—For the quotation which, notwithstanding its late date, and the objections which will be noticed a few sentences onwards, must stand as the chief text concerning this term, see *Prolegomena*, p. xix.

It relates to the *Rugiani*, *Runi*, *Rani*, or *Verani*;* the Slavonians of the Isle of Rugen, in the ninth century. Zeuss, from whom I take it, adds, however, that it has nothing *in common with the German gentile name Rugi, and that the coincidence is purely accidental.* "*Rugia, Rugen, nichts mit dem deutschen Volksnamen Rugi gemein hat und das Uebereinkommen rein zufällig ist.*"

If this mean the *Rugii* of the fifth century (see *Epilegomena*, § *Rugii*) I agree with him; but not, if it mean the Rugii of Tacitus. For more, see next note.

[15] *Lemovii.*]—If we admit the parts about the rivers Dwina and Memel to be the locality of the Lemovii, we may deal with the word as a derivative; in which case the radical part of the word will be the syllable *Lem-*.

Adam of Bremen mentions the *Lami* as being the neighbours of the *Curi* of Courland.

Pomponius Sabinus (about A.D. 1480) mentions the *Læm*-onii.

Dusberg speaks of the Terra *Lam*-otina.

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Angli.*

Now, though all this is taken from the 682nd page of Zeuss, when speaking of the *Lami*, not one word of it appears in p. 155, where he notices the *Lemovii*. On the contrary, he finds nothing nearer these last-named tribes in sound and geography than the *Lim*-fiord of Jutland. Yet Tacitus's locality of the *Lemovii* is certainly not very far from that of the *Lami*.

Zeuss does all this; nay, more, he does it in the face of two remarks of his own—*viz.*, that the derivational element *ov* (Lem-*ov-ii*) appears in no other German word, and that in some MSS. of Tacitus the reading was *Lemonii*.

Now these *Lami* are the *Liven*, *i.e.*, the most western branch of the Ugrian Finns of Esthonia, a nation now nearly extinct, having been encroached on by the Germans, and the Letts of *Liv*onia (*Lief*-land); *Liv*onia, of which the name is referable to these early, but now displaced, occupants.

The change from *m* to *v* was not immediate. Nestor gives the intermediate form *Lib*.

Now what if some place, in the name of which the combination *R-g* occurs, be nearer these *Liv*-en than even the Isle of Rugen?

In this case we have a complication—a complication which arises from the fact that, although the Isle of Rugen may be a likely place for the *Rugii* of Tacitus, as against the *Rugii* of the Odoacer, it is not so against the locality, or the people (be it which it may) from which the present town of *Riga* takes its name. Less prominent in history than the *Rugii* of *Rugen*, they are nearer the *Lami*—and this gives us a composition of difficulties.

Again—Ptolemy has a place called 'Ῥούγιον on the mouth of the Oder, and there is a *Roga*-land in Scandinavia. Upon the whole, I think the *Rugii* of Tacitus are the people of the Gulf of *Riga*.

XLIV. Suionum[1] hinc civitates, ipso in Oceano, præter viros armaque classibus valent: forma navium eò differt, quòd utrimque prora paratam semper appulsui frontem agit: nec velis ministrantur, nec remos in ordinem lateribus adjungunt. Solutum, ut in qui-

busdam fluminum, et mutabile, ut res poscit, hinc vel illinc remigium. Est apud illos et opibus honos: eóque unus imperitat, nullis jam exceptionibus, non precario jure parendi; nec arma, ut apud ceteros Germanos, in promiscuo, sed clausa sub custode, et quidem servo: quia subitos hostium incursus prohibet Oceanus. Otiosæ porro armatorum manus facilè lasciviunt: enimverò neque nobilem, neque ingenuum, ne libertinum quidem armis præponere regia utilitas est.

NOTE ON SECTION XLIV.

[1] *Suionum.*]—The *-n* is no part of the root, but an inflexion—the *-n* of the weak declension; the Anglo-Saxon form being *Sve-an*, and the Icelandic *Svi-ar.* The common compound, however, is *Svi-þiod* =the *Svi-people;* the *þiod* being the same as the *Deut-* in *Deut-sche.*

The present Swedish name for *Swe-den* is *Sve-rige,* a word like *bishop-ric=the kingdom (ric) of the Svia.*

This shows that the language of the first informants about the *Suiones* was a Gothic dialect.

But it does not show that the root *Sui-* was Gothic. This, like the root *Kent-* in the Anglo-Saxon forms *Kent-ing* and *Cant-ware,* may belong to another language.

This reduces the internal evidence of the *Suiones* of Tacitus having been Gothic to the single fact that the root *Sui-* enters in the name of the *Swedes*—a fact (as has been suggested in the remarks on the words *Suevi* and *Saxo*) by no means conclusive. Still it is, perhaps, *primâ facie* evidence.

XLV. Trans Suionas aliud mare pigrum,[1] ac propè immotum, quo cingi cludique terrarum orbem hinc fides: quòd extremus cadentis jam solis fulgor in ortus edurat, adeò clarus, ut sidera hebetet. Sonum

insuper emergentis audiri, formasque deorum, et radios capitis[2] aspici persuasio adjicit. Illuc usque (et fama vera) tantùm natura. Ergo jam dextro Suevici maris[3] litore Æstiorum gentes[4] alluuntur: quibus ritus habitusque Suevorum, lingua Britannicæ propior.[5] Matrem deûm venerantur: insigne superstitionis, formas aprorum gestant. Id pro armis omnique tutelâ: securum deæ cultorem etiam inter hostes præstat. Rarus ferri, frequens fustium usus. Frumenta ceterosque fructus patientiùs, quàm pro solitâ Germanorum inertiâ, laborant. Sed et mare scrutantur; ac soli omnium succinum, quod ipsi *glesum* vocant, inter vada atque in ipso litore legunt. Nec, quæ natura, quæve ratio gignat, ut barbaris, quæsitum compertumve. Diu quinetiam inter cetera ejectamenta maris jacebat, donec luxuria nostra dedit nomen: ipsis in nullo usu; rude legitur, informe perfertur, pretiumque mirantes accipiunt. Succum tamen arborum esse intelligas, quia terrena quædam atque etiam volucria animalia plerumque interlucent, quæ implicata humore, mox durescente materiâ, cluduntur. Fecundiora igitur nemora lucosque, sicut Orientis secretis, ubi thura balsamaque sudantur, ita Occidentis insulis terrisque inesse crediderim, quæ vicini solis radiis expressa atque liquentia in proximum mare labuntur, ac vi tempestatum in adversa litora exundant. Si naturam succini admoto igne tentes, in modum tedæ accenditur, alitque flammam pinguem et olentem: mox ut in picem resinamve lentescit. Suionibus Sitonum gentes continuantur. Cetera similes, uno differunt, quòd femina dominatur:[6] in tantum non modò a libertate, sed etiam a servitute degenerant. Hìc Sueviæ finis.

NOTES ON SECTION XLV.

[1] *Aliud mare pigrum.*]—The Arctic Ocean.

[2] *Radios capitis.*]—The Aurora Borealis (?).

[3] *Suevici maris.*]—The Norse form was probably something like *Svi-haf,** just as *Nord-hav*, at the present moment=the *North-sea*: *haf* being the Scandinavian word for both *sea* and *ocean*; in which case the *-v* in *Suev-*, is, really, the *-v-* in *hav*.

At any rate, it seems safe to consider the formation of the word as applied to the *Swedish Sea*, as different from that of the *Suev-*, in *Suevi* and *Suevia*; though no such difference is recognized by Tacitus.

Indeed, we must attribute some unsteadiness of expression to him here.

a. The rites and customs of the Æstii are Suevic. — This may, possibly, apply to the Suevi of Suabia, and Franconia.

b. Hic (beyond Finland) *Sueviæ finis.* This can scarcely do so.

[4] *Æstiorum gentes.*]—The word *gentes* prepares us to expect in *Æstii*—as in Suevi—a *collective* name. Such is, really, the case.

That the *Æstii* of Tacitus were the occupants of the present coast of Prussia and Courland, is shown by what is said about the *amber-trade*. This fixes the locality as definitely as Ætna would fix Sicily, or Vesuvius Campania.

Like *Suiones*, *Æstii* is a word from a Gothic informant.

The form in which it reached Tacitus was probably *Easte*—*i.e.*, the strong form of the grammarians.

But the weak form was also used since, in a quotation which will soon appear, we find the form 'Ωστίωνες=*Eastan*.

As this is one of the three non-compound words,† for which I not only assume an etymology, but argue from it, I shall consider the form of the word somewhat at length.

It, apparently, is not an unexceptionable form. Being a geographical rather than a gentile name, we should expect to find it *com-*

* With the article *Svi-hav-et*, like *Nord-hav-et*.

† See *Prolegomena*, p. liii.

pound, *i.e.*, in some form equivalent to East-*men*, *East-ware* (like Cant-*ware*), East-*land*, or East-*sætan* (like Dor-set).

Failing this we should expect, at least, a derivative form such as Easter-*ling*, East-*ing*.

The form, however, is simple; just as if we said the *Easts*.

Simple, however, as it is, the following extract from Alfred places its meaning beyond reasonable doubt:—"Seo Visle is swiðe micel ea, and hio to lið Vit-land, and Veonod-land, and þæt Vit-land, belimpeð to *Estum*, and seo Visle lið ut of Veonod-lande, and lið in *Est*mere, and se *Est*mere, is huru fiftene mila brad. Thonne cymeð Ilfing eastan in *Est*mere, of þæm mere þe Truso standeð in staðe, and cumað ut samod in *Est*mere Ilfing *eastan* of *East*lande, and Visle suðan of Veonodlande."

It is as safe, then, to consider the word *Æstii* to mean the *men of the East*, as it is to consider the word German; since—

1. The form of the word coincides with its geographical import.

2. The particular word in question is known to have been applied by the Germans to the particular parts in question.

3. There is no other language but the German in which it occurs with the same power.

4. The German name for the present *Esthonians* is *Esthen*; their country being *Est-land*.

This last fact suggests an objection.

It may be said to prove too much, *i.e.*, to prove that these supposed *Æstian* the *Eastern* populations are not sufficiently *in the East*, *i.e.*, that the true *Eastern* countries of the Baltic are on the Gulf of Finland.

Alfred's evidence meets this.

Again—the fact of the *Esthonians* being the *present* Esthen, or *men of the East*, is by no means conclusive as to the *Esthonians* having been the *Æstii* of Tacitus. A term like the one in question would apply to different countries according to the advance of geographical knowledge; ceasing to be characteristic as soon as fresh tracts *east* of those which it originally designated by it became known.

At any rate, the present *Esthonia* may have been the most *eastern* part of the *Æstian* country.

Thirdly—at the mouth of the river Niemen, and nearly coinciding with the division between East Prussia and Courland, and coinciding equally nearly with the amber locality of the Æstii, the direction of

the coast changes suddenly from east to north; so much so as to make the parts in question, for some time, the most eastern extremity of the Baltic. From Memel to Windau, the navigation is due north, and it is only by keeping along the coast that the Gulf of Riga is found to form a bend towards the east. The Gulf of Finland does so still more. But this is only for a while. Finland itself is nearly in the same longitude with Courland.

Unless, then, we take in the Gulfs of Riga and Finland, the country of the Æstii is really the east-end of the Baltic.

Furthermore—except for the purposes of a special trade, the gulfs in question were not likely to be visited; since from the position of the islands Oesel and Dago, at the entrance of the Gulf of Riga, and the narrowness of the entrance of the Gulf of Finland, it was not necessary for even the most cautious coasters to follow the line of the land, on a voyage from Memel in Courland to Abo in Finland.

It is likely, then, that those Germans, who applied the term *Æstii* to the Courlanders, made no account of the Gulfs of Riga and Finland; in which cases the *Curische Nehrung* was rightly designated as *eastern*, κατ' ἐξόχην.

We, however, who *do* make account of those great indentations, placed our *East-men* in Esthonia.

The quotation alluded to is one from Stephanus Byzantinus—'Ωστίωνες, ἔθνος παρὰ τῷ ὠκεανῷ δυτικῷ οὓς Κοσσίνους Ἀρτεμίδωρός φησι, Πυθέας Ὠστιαίους.

Pytheas is the voyager, whose account of the Baltic about 320 B.C. is treated with some contempt by Strabo.—i. p. 63.

However, it by no means follows that because the name was Gothic it applied to a Gothic population; indeed, as far as we can get evidence for a negative fact, it is against the word *Æstii* being a native name.

There is plenty of mention between the time of Tacitus and the eleventh century of these same *Æstii;* but it is only by writers who were themselves either Germans or adopters of the German geography that the name is *Hæst-*, *Aist-*, or some similar form.

General, however, as the name is in the Germanic authorities, is it rare in those of Russia, Prussia, Poland? Probably, it is not to be found at all. Instead, thereof, we have the term *Pruss* (*Prussian*) or the more remarkable form *Guddon*.

These remarks upon the form and origin of the word have been

given at large, because Zeuss, who admits so many less probable derivations, not only keeps the adjective *east* entirely out of sight, but disguises the word by writing it *Aisten*, on the very inferior authority of Eginhart—"Litus australe Sclavi et *Aisti* et aliæ diversæ incolunt nationes."—Vit. Car. Magn. c. 12.

The existence of the amber-trade explains the reference made in the note upon the word *Gothones* to the present one.

The locality of the amber-trade fixes the Gothones even as it does the Æstii, and by fixing them in the same locality at the same time identifies the two.

This identification is of so much importance that the details of the proof will be given minutely.

Pliny's form is *Guttones.*

Tacitus's in the Annals (ii. 62) *Gotones;* in the present text *Gothones.*

Ptolemy's Γύθωνες.

Pliny's locality is *Æstuarium* Oceani Mentonomon nomine.*

Tacitus's *trans Lygios, i.e.,* north of Poland.

Ptolemy's παρὰ τὸν Οὐΐστουλαν ποταμὸν ὑπὸ τοὺς Οὐενέδας.

Pliny connects them with the amber-country.

That the Κόσσινοι of Artemidorus is the same word is likely; the σσ=ττ, as in ϑαλάττα and ϑαλάσσα, &c.

Now, the notices of the amber-country might reach the Greeks or Romans by two routes. 1. It might come across the continent; and that, wholly by land, or by the Vistula, Theiss, and Danube, or by the Priepetz and Dnieper. In this case the carriers of the article, and the informants as to its country and collectors, would be *Slavonians.*

2. It might come by sea, in which case *Germans* would be—partially at least—the carriers of the article, and the informants as to its country and collectors.

Now it is clear, that, if the Germans had one term, and the Slavonians another, for a nation in the amber-country, that nation would be known to a Greek or Roman under two names; and it is nearly certain that this was the case in the present instance. The *Gothones* were *Æstii* when the notice came from Germany. The *Æstii* were *Gothones* when the notice came from Slavonia.

Lest this should seem an over-refinement, we must remember that, if *Æstii* = *Este* = *Eastmen*, and if the *Æstian* tongue were as

* Probably, no true *Æstuarium*, but the word *Est-ware* misunderstood.

Tacitus makes it, something other than German, a *second* name is a matter of necessity—since the one in Tacitus (*Æstii*) could not possibly be *native*. Yet a native name must have existed, and what, in the present stage of the argument, is more likely than *Gothon* (*Gutton*)?

When Tacitus follows the coast-line of the Baltic, he comes to the *Æstii*. When he starts from the Marcomanni and Lygii, he reaches the *Gothones*.

His expression *trans Lygios* is one of remarkable accuracy. The line which separates the most northern province of Poland (Masovia) from East Prussia, is also the line which separates the nations speaking the dialects derived from the Æstian or Gothonic, from the nations speaking the dialects descended from Lekh or Polish.

The extent to which the German name was unknown to the Sarmatians, and *vice versâ*, is shown in more ways than one, and it easily accounts for Tacitus's describing the same people under different designations, when we approached the notice of their country from different quarters. That the Sarmatian name was either *Pruss* or *Guddon* has been already stated; and it is safe to say from the following remarkable address of Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, to the people of the amber-country, that if they were *Goth-ic* in any way, it was an unknown fact to the Goths of Italy.

"*Hæstis* Theodoricus rex. Illo et illo legatis vestris venientibus grande vos studium notitiæ nostræ habuisse cognovimus; ut *in Oceani litoribus constituti*, cum nostra mente jungamini: suavis nobis admodum et grata petitio, ut ad vos perveniret fama nostra, ad quos nulla potuimus destinare mandata. Amate jam cognitum, quem requisistis ambienter ignotum. Nam inter tot gentes viam præsumere, non est aliquid facile concupiisse. Et ideo salutatione vos affectuosa requirentes, indicamus *succina, quæ a vobis per harum portitores directa sunt*, grato animo fuisse suscepta, quæ ad vos Oceani unda descendens, hanc levissimam substantiam, sicut et vestrorum relatio continebat, exportat; sed unde veniat, incognitum vos habere dixerunt, quam ante omnes homines patria vestra offerente suscipitis. Hæc quodam Cornelio scribente legitur in interioribus insulis Oceani ex arboris succo defluens, unde et succinum dicitur, paulatim solis ardore coalescere. Fit enim sudatile metallum teneritudo perspicua, modo croceo colore rubens, modo flammea claritate pinguescens, ut cum in maris fuerit delapsa confinio, æstu alternante purgata, vestris litoribus tradatur exposita. Quod ideo judicavimus

indicandum, ne omnino putetis notitiam nostram fugere, quod occultum creditis vos habere. Proinde requirite nos sæpius per vias, quas amor vester aperuit. Quia semper prodest divitum regum acquisita concordia, qui dum parvo munere leniuntur, majore semper compensatione prospiciunt. Aliqua vobis etiam per legatos vestros verbo mandavimus, per quos quæ grata esse debeant nos destinasse declaramus."—Cassiod. Variar. v. 2.

The further confirmation which this view receives from the facts connected with the modern name *Guddon* is exhibited in *Epilegomena, § Goths.*

[5] *Lingua Britannicæ propior.*]—Here an author like Tacitus commits himself to a definite statement, and it must not be set aside on light grounds. Either the *a priori* probabilities against it must be great, or some reasonable origin of the mistake must be pointed out.

The latter can be done—not exactly as the statement about the *Gothini* was explained, but in a somewhat similar manner. The language that the people of the amber-coast really spoke when they first become definitely known, was the *Prussian.* Now the form of the name which that language took was sufficiently like the word *British* to be mistaken for it.

1. First, we must remember that Tacitus's information came from Germany.

2. Next, that the word meaning *Prussian* was *not* German. The Germans got it from the Slavonians, and, consequently, were likely to confound it with some more familiar term.

3. The word denoting *British was* such a familiar term.

4. The adjectival termination was nearly the same in both languages.

This prepares us for the evidence in favour of words at present so unlike as *Prussian* and *British* ever having been like.

The first occurrence of the name of the modern kingdom of Prussia occurs in Gaudentius, who accompanied Bishop Adalbert to that country between A.D. 997—1006.

Zeuss, from whom, as usual, I am taking my best facts, admits that the term was Slavonic. "Der Name wird zuerst—ohne Zweifel von Slawen gehört."—p. 671.

He also suggests that no argument against its antiquity is to be taken from its being there recorded by a German for the first time.

It might have been as old as the name *Æstii.* "Ist der Name Prusi so alt, als der Name Aisten, wenn er auch mehr als ein Jahrtausend später auftritt."—Ibid.

Gaudentius's form is not *Prussi* but *Pruzzi.*

Dietmar's form is also not *Prussi* but *Pruci.*

Adam's of Bremen is also not *Prussi* but *Pruzzi* and *Prutzci.*

This shows that the sound was that of *ts*, or *tsh*, or, possibly, even *shtsh* rather than of a simple *-s;* a matter of some importance, as it helps to account for the *t* required to make the root *Pruss-* like the root *Brit-*.

Now comes the important fact that we find the word taking an adjectival form in *-en*, in which case the *s* becomes *th*. The substantival forms are *Pruzzi, Prussi, Pruscia, Pruschia, Prutzci, Prussia;* but the adjectival ones are *Prutheni, Pruthenia, Pruthenicus.* We are now getting near the form *Britannicus;* and it must be remembered that the form thus similar, is the form almost always used when the language is spoken of—lingua *Pruthenica* not *Prussa.*

The root *Russ* undergoes a similar series of transformation—*Russi, Russia, Ruthenicus, Ruthenia.*

Lastly, the form *Borussi* accounts for the *B.*

All this, however, it may be said, applies to the Latin language, and is, consequently, out of place; the question being whether *Slavonian* forms of the root *Prus* can become sufficiently like an equivalent modification of the root *Brit-* to create confusion. They can. The Slavonic word which a German would translate by *Brittisc*, and a Roman by *Britannica*, would be Brit-*skaja*, and the similar equivalent to *Pruttisc* and *Pruthenica*, Prut-*skaja.*

This gives us then the Æstii and Gothones (or rather the Æstii *or* Gothones) as the representatives of the old Prussians or Lithuanian Sarmatians of the Baltic.

In the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, when information becomes sufficiently clear to give us the details of the nations and tribes allied to the *Æstii*, we find them to be as follows:—

1. The *Galind-itæ*, the Γαλίνδαι of Ptolemy.

2. The *Sudo-vitæ*, conterminous with the *Galinditæ*, both being in the neighbourhood of the Spirding-See.

3. The *Pomesani*, on the right bank of the Lower Vistula.

4. *Pogesani* on the *Frische Haf.*

5. *Warmienses, Jarmenses, Hermini*, and the people of the *Orma-* and of the Old Norse Sagas; between the *Po-gesani* and the—

6. *Nattangi*, on the Pregel.

7. *Barthi.*

8. *Nadro-vitæ.*—A case may, perhaps, be made out for the *Nadro-vitæ* being the *Nahar-vali*, under a slightly modified name; the facts and reasoning running thus:—

a. Both agree in being a population to which the preeminently holy seat of worship of their stock belonged. Thus, whilst the *Naharvali* were as they are described by Tacitus, the Nadro-*vitæ*, obstinate in their Paganism, above even the other obstinately Pagan Lithuanians, are thus described:—"Fuit autem in medio nationis hujus perversæ, scilicet *in Nadrovia, locus quidam dictus Romow,* trahens nomen suum a Roma, *in quo habitabat quidam dictus Criwe,* quem colebant pro Papa. Quia sicut dominus Papa regit universalem ecclesiam fidelium, ita *ad istius nutum seu mandatum non solum gentes prædictæ, sed et Lethowini et aliæ nationes Livoniæ terræ regebantur.*"—Dusb. iii. 5.

b. The *-d-* in *Nadro-* may be got rid of by supposing some older form *Nador*, in which case, the ejection of the *-d-* is not only allowable but likely; since it is a consonant which, when it comes between two vowels, is often omitted in pronunciation, *e.g.*, *Sa-d-el* in Danish is sounded *Sa'el*, &c. This would reduce *Nador-* to *Na'or-*, or *Nahar-*.

c. The elements *-vit* and *-gal*, if they do not exactly replace each other in certain Lithuanic names, are found attached to the same root in the words Samo-*gitæ* (also Samo-*vitæ*), and Semi-*galli*, the names of two scarcely distinguishable sections (or subsections) of the same population.

9. *Sam-bitæ.*

10. *Scalo-vitæ.*

These details nearly coincide with the more general account of Dusburg (iii. 3).—"Terra Pruschiæ in undecim partes dividitur. Prima fuit *Culmensis et Lubavia,* quæ ante introitum fratrum domus Teutonicæ quasi fuerat desolata. Secunda *Pomesania*, in qua *Pomesani.* Tertia *Pogesania,* in qua *Pogesani.* Quarta *Warmia,* in qua *Warmienses.* Quinta *Nattangia,* in qua *Nattangi.* Sexta *Sambia,* in qua *Sambitæ.* Septima *Nadrovia,* in qua *Nadrovitæ.* Octava *Scalovia,* in qua *Scalovitæ.* Nona *Sudovia,* in qua *Sudovitæ.* Decima *Galindia.* Undecima *Barthe et Plica Bartha, quæ nunc major et minor Bartha dicitur,* in qua *Barthi vel Barthenses* habitabant. Vix aliqua istarum nationum fuit, quæ non haberet ad bellum duo millia virorum equitum, et multa millia pugnatorum."

These were the tribes and nations akin to the *Æstii* of Tacitus in East and West Prussia—the speakers of the language which was said to be *Britannicæ propior*, and which really was *Pruthenica.**

All the previous names were native and Lithuanian, since there was a native Lithuanian *eponymus* for each, as may be seen in the following extract from a fragment of a work, De Borussorum origine ex Domino Christiano; Christian being the first Prussian bishop.—"Duces fuere duo, nempe Bruteno et Wudawutto, quorum alterum scilicet Bruteno sacerdotem crearunt, alterum scilicet Wudawutto in regem elegerunt . . Rex Wudawutto duodecim liberos masculos habebat, quorum nomina fuerunt *Litpho*, *Saimo*, *Sudo*, *Naidro*, *Scalawo*, *Natango*, *Bartho*, *Galindo*, *Warmo*, *Hoggo*, *Pomesso*, *Chelmo* . . . *Warmo* nonus filius Wudawutti, a quo Warmia dicta, reliquit uxorem *Arma*, unde Ermelandt."

Of Courland and Livonia, the *Æstii* of authentic history, and under their native names, are—

1. The *Curi*, or *Curones*, from whom is derived the name of the country.

2, 3, 4. The Letti, Ydumei and Selones of Livonia.

[6] *Sitonum — femina dominatur.*] — I cannot say to whose well-exercised ingenuity the interpretation of this curious passage is due. It is as follows:—

The *native* name of the Finns of Finland (when they do not call themselves Suomelainen) is *Qvæn*.

The Swedish for *woman* is *quinna*.

Either a misinterpretation of these two words, or else an ill-understood play upon them, gave rise to the notion of a female sovereign.

This notion develops itself further. Alfred speaks of the *Cvenas*, and *Cvena-land*: but Adam of Bremen goes farther.—"Gothi habitant usque ad Bircam, postea longis terrarum spatiis regnant Sveones usque ad *terram feminarum*."—De Situ Daniæ, c. 222. "Et hæc quidem insula *terræ feminarum* proxima narratur."—Ibid. 224.

* How like, and how different, the two adjectives may be, is shown in the following columns:—

English . .	*British* . .	*Prussian.*
Latin . .	*Britannica* .	*Pruthenica.*
Anglo-Saxon .	*Bryttisce* . .	*Pryttisce.*
Slavonic . .	*Britskaja* . .	*Prutskaja.*

Observe, too, that the names of both the Prussians and Britons is a form of the root *Br-t*.

"Circa hæc litora—ferunt esse *Amazonas*, quod nunc *terra feminarum* dicitur, quas aquæ gustu aliqui dicunt concipere. . . Hæ, simul viventes spernunt consortia virorum, quos etiam, si advenerint, a se viriliter repellunt."—C. 228.

Femina dominatur. — That a female should exercise regal power was extraordinary, not so much in the eyes of Tacitus (who, in the case of the British Boadicea, mentioned by him in the Agricola, merely remarks, *neque enim sexum in imperiis discernunt*, without any suggestion of the extent to which it is the measure of a servile temper on the part of the nation), but in those of the Germans who were the first informants about the Sitones. So early was the spirit which dictated the Salic law in force.

XLVI. Peucinorum, Venedorumque, et Fennorum nationes Germanis an Sarmatis adscribam dubito: quamquam Peucini, quos quidam Bastarnas[1] vocant, sermone, cultu, sede, ac domiciliis, ut Germani agunt: sordes omnium ac torpor: procerum connubiis mixtis, nonnihil in Sarmatarum habitum fœdantur. Venedi[2] multum ex moribus traxerunt. Nam quidquid inter Peucinos Fennosque[3] silvarum ac montium erigitur, latrociniis pererrant. Hi tamen inter Germanos potiùs referuntur, quia et domos fingunt, et scuta gestant, et pedum usu ac pernicitate gaudent; quæ omnia diversa Sarmatis sunt, in plaustro equoque viventibus. Fennis mira feritas, fœda paupertas: non arma, non equi, non penates: victui herba, vestitui pelles: cubile humus: sola in sagittis spes, quas inopiâ ferri, ossibus asperant. Idemque venatus viros pariter ac feminas alit. Passim enim comitantur, partemque prædæ petunt. Nec aliud infantibus ferarum imbriumque suffugium, quàm ut in aliquo ramorum nexu contegantur: huc redeunt juvenes, hoc senum

receptaculum. Sed beatius arbitrantur, quàm ingemere agris, illaborare domibus, suas alienasque fortunas spe metuque versare. Securi adversùs homines, securi adversùs deos, rem difficillimam adsecuti sunt, ut illis ne voto quidem opus esset. Cetera jam fabulosa: "Hellusios et Oxionas[4] ora hominum vultusque, corpora atque artus ferarum gerere:" quod ego, ut incompertum, in medium relinquam.

NOTES ON SECTION XLVI.

[1] *Peucini—Bastarnas.*]—The Bastarnæ took a prominent part in the wars of Philip, the father of Perseus, against the Romans. Persuaded to become his allies, they cross the Danube; *Cotto*, one of their nobles, being sent forward as ambassador. It was part of Philip's plan to place the Bastarnæ in the country of the Dardani, so that this latter nation (*infestissima Macedoniæ*) might be destroyed by them, and then "*Bastarnæ, relictis in Dardania conjugibus liberisque, ad populandum Italiam mitterentur.*"

They enter Thrace, the Thracians retire to Mount Donuca. Here the Bastarnæ divide. Thirty thousand reach Dardania. The rest cross the Danube homewards. All this took place in the year of the death of Philip.—Livy, xl. 57, 58.

Strabo's evidence is remarkable:—'Εν δὲ τῇ μεσογαίᾳ Βαστάρναι μὲν τοῖς Τυριγέταις ὅμοροι καὶ Γερμανοῖς, σχεδόν τι καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ γένους ὄντες, εἰς πλείω φῦλα διῃρημένοι. Καὶ γὰρ Ἄτμονοι λέγονταί τινες, καὶ Σιδόνες, οἱ δὲ τὴν Πεύκην κατασχόντες, τὴν ἐν τῷ Ἴστρῳ νῆσον, Πευκινοί.

This seems the evidence upon which they are made German: Pliny having done so before, "Germanorum genera quinque—Quinta pars *Peucini*, *Basternæ* . . contermini Dacis."—H. N. iv. 14.

This has given the Bastarnæ great prominence in ethnology; since they have the credit of being the first Germans mentioned by name in history.

Again—if the Basternæ be German, the likelihood of the Getæ being so is increased; and the two supposed facts reflect probability on each other. Complications of this sort are of continual occurrence in ethnology.

It is just possible that the Bastarnæ were Germans—not that I mean by this that the proper area of the Germans reached so far as Thrace and Mœsia, the Bastarnic locality, but that the Germans of the Danube, might have begun their encroachments in an easterly direction thus early, and have reached thus far. They might have been *intrusive* Germans in the quarters where Livy places them.

But it is far from being certain that even this supposition is necessary. Strabo's statement merely goes to their exhibiting German characteristics, and having Germans in their neighbourhood. Pliny is rarely to be taken as an independent witness. Tacitus speaks explicitly as to the most characteristic facts; yet doubts as to the inference from them. In one point he is either wrong or inexplicable. If *sede* mean *geographical position*, his statement is wholly incompatible with all that writers say about the locality of the Bastarnæ (on the Lower Danube), and the limits of his own *Germania.*

I think we may safely say that, in the passage of Strabo which makes the Bastarnæ German, there is a qualifying expression of doubt, and in that of Tacitus doubt and unsatisfactory language as well.

Reference to other writers increases rather than diminishes the complications.

Livy's evidence makes them *Gauls;* since he calls their leader in one place Clondicus dux *Bastarnarum* (xl. 58) and in another (applying to the same series of events) Clondicus, regulus *Gallorum* (xliv. 26).

He also writes—"Per *Scordiscos* iter esse ad mare Hadriaticum Italiamque. Alia via traduci exercitum non posse. Facile Bastarnis Scordiscos iter daturos; nec enim aut lingua aut moribus æquales abhorrere."

Now whenever the Scordisci are referred to any of the recognized divisions of antiquity, they are called Γαλάται, or Galli—whether rightly or wrongly is another question.

Plutarch does the same as Livy—Ὑπεκίνει δὲ (nempe Perseus) καὶ Γαλάτας, τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἴστρον ᾠκημένους, οἳ Βαστάρναι καλοῦνται.—Vit. Paul. Æmil. c. 9.

The Bastarnæ were distinguished from their neighbours—warlike as these were—by superior bravery, vast stature, and intense love of fighting—Ἄνδρες ὑψηλοὶ μὲν τὰ σώματα, θαυμαστοὶ δὲ τὰς μελέτας, μεγάλαυχοι δὲ καὶ λαμπροὶ ταῖς κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων ἀπειλαῖς.—Plut. Vit. Paul. Æmil. 12.

The fragment of Scymnus makes them immigrants or conquerors.

Οὗτοι δὲ Θρᾷκες, Βαστάρναι τ' ἐπήλυδες.

Upon the whole the evidence of the Bastarnæ being German is very inconclusive.

[2] *Venedi.*]—The particular Venedi of Tacitus must have been those nations of the interior who were too far inland to be described with the *Æstii* and *Sitones* of the coast, and too far to the north and east to have been described with the *Lygii* and *Burii*, and those other populations which were approached from the south. These were chiefly the Lithuanians of Lithuania; not, however, to the exclusion of some of the more eastern Slavonians. It is safe to suppose this; since there is no trace of any distinction between the Lithuanians and Slavonians having been made by the Germans.

[3] *Fennosque.*]—The name *Finn*, as applied to the natives of *Finland* is *not* native. It *is* Gothic—both German and Norse.

Neither is it native as applied to the Laplanders of *Finmark;* although many of them have adopted it.

Hence, the Romans took the names of the Baltic Finns from the Germans.

From whom did the Germans take them?

A suggestion of Geyer's, adopted by Bähr, is much to the point. The Finnic root *suom-* means *fen;* and many Finnic tribes call themselves by names compounded of *s-m*. Thus, the Esthonians are *Some-lassed=fen-men;* the Finlanders *Suomelainen*, the Laplanders *Sabmelads*, and the Karelians *Suomaemejet*. Lastly, the name *Samoeid*, which is *not* native,* and which *is* probably a Finn denomination adopted by the Russians, is reasonably supposed to come from the same root. Putting all together, it is likely that the term *Fen-* or *Fin-* is the *translation* of *Suom*.

At the present time the ethnology of the tribes allied to both the Finns of Finland, and Lapps of Lapland, is clear. Each section belongs to the great *Ugrian* stock.

But it is the evidence of language which has given us this group. The evidence of physical conformation is more against than for it.

At the time of Tacitus no such generalization was practicable—

* The native name is *Nvenez*, or *Khasovo=men*.

since the languages were wholly unknown, and the evidence they supplied unappreciated.

Hence the test was less refined. As a consequence of this, what we call *Ugrian* was, in the time of Tacitus, partly *Finn* and partly *Sitonian.*

1. The first was the name where the physical conformation was that of the Lapps, a people to whom, at the present moment, the term *Finn* is limited by the Scandinavians of Norway and Sweden.

2. The second was that where the physical conformation was not much different from that of the Germans; and it comprised (probably with many other sections) the *Qvæns* or Finlanders—whose bulk and physical strength is by no means, palpably and contrastedly, inferior to that of the Swedes, Russians, and Lithuanians. Of these the Sitones (or Qvæns of Finland) were the chief. Tacitus makes them *Suevic;* by *Suevic* probably (but not indisputably) meaning *Suionic.*

Now the separation of what we now called Ugrians into the Sitonians and Finns is, in reality, the natural inference from the remarkable contrast between the Ugrians of the Lapp type, and the Ugrians of the Finlandic; a difference which exists at the present moment as strongly as ever it could have done in the time of Tacitus, a difference, too, which, even in the present days of ethnological classification, has been often overvalued. Hence, the separation of the Sitones from the Fenni is no argument against the former being Finlanders, *i.e., Qvæns,* properly so called, Finns of Finland, improperly. It is just such a separation as many an ethnologist would make now. The difference which it is most important to remember is that between the words Qvæn and Finn *as names*—a difference which *we* of England draw less definitely than did Tacitus; or, at least, Tacitus's informants.

[4] *Hellusios et Oxionas.*]—Upon the latter of these names I can throw but little light. On the former I can only remark the resemblance of their name to Ptolemy's river *Chalusus* (Χαλούσος πόταμος) and the Chali (Χάλοι).

But these are in the parts about the Lower Elbe, or the rivers of Mecklenburg, or the Eyder, or, perhaps, the *Trave;* to the last of which the name *Chalusus* has been supposed to apply. Still, they may be the parts to which Tacitus refers; notwithstanding the fact of the Hellusii being mentioned along with the Sitones and Finns

of the extreme *eastern* end of the Baltic. His transitions from one geographical area to another are sometimes very abrupt; whilst the characteristic which brings them within the same category with the Fenni and Sitones is the comparative obscurity of their history.

Such being the case, I think it possible that, after having dispatched the ill-understood families of Finland, Tacitus may take leave of his subject with a cursory notice of their equivalents, in obscurity, on the side of Denmark.

EPILEGOMENA.

§ I. THE DATE OF THE GERMANIA, AS COMPARED WITH THE OTHER WORKS OF TACITUS.—GERMANIC POPULATIONS MENTIONED IN THE ANNALS AND HISTORY, BUT NOT IN THE GERMANIA.

NIEBUHR has expressed an opinion, that the *Germania* was written during the youth of Tacitus.

Whatever other reasons there may be for holding this view, there is the following,—

A writer in a monograph is generally fuller of details than he is in a general work. Now in the Annals and History, there are several German tribes mentioned, of which no notice is taken in the *Germania*, and this omission is explained by the notion, that Tacitus's knowledge increased between the composition of the different works. Strange as it is, that he should not have known the *Sicambri*, *Ampsivarii*, &c., when the *Germania* was written, it is stranger still, that he should have known and not enumerated them.

Hence, the Annals and History are, to a certain extent, the complement to the Germania, and similarly to compare small things with great, the present *Epilegomena* form the complement to the Notes.

Of the populations mentioned in the Annals and History, but not mentioned in the Germania, the following is the list.

1. *The Sicambri.*—First mentioned by Cæsar on the Lower Rhine (see extracts p. lxxix.), the Sicambri take considerable prominence and importance in the reign of Augustus. Being conquered by Drusus, they appear more than once in the poetry of both Ovid and Horace, as formidable enemies now humbled. Indeed, few names were more associated with the ideas of murderous ferocity and savage bravery than that of the *Sicamber*.

In A.D. 26, a *Sicambra cohors* was employed as far from its own country as Thrace.

This is believed to have permanently settled in Hungary, on the very spot whereon the city of Buda was afterwards built. In a work quoted by Grimm, as *Inscriptiones Sacrosanctæ Vetustatis*, a stone said to have been dug up, "in Buda veteri, Mathiæ regis Ungariæ tempore, dum fundamenta jacerentur ædium Beatricis reginæ," bears the following inscription,—"Legio Sicambrorum hic præsidio collocata civitatem ædificaverunt quam ex suo nomine Sicambriam vocaverunt."

The authenticity, however, of this stone is doubtful; and, even if were not so, the ethnological fact it conveyed would be, in and of itself, minute and unimportant. It has been noticed, however, for a special reason. The fact of Sicambrians on the Danube, as well as Sicambrians on the Rhine, has been admitted as undoubted. Instead, however, of the colony being allowed to account for it, a Danubian origin for the Rhenish Sicambrians, with migrations to match, has been inferred.

By the end of the first century, the name Sicambri has become of comparatively rare occurrence, and the very fact of its not appearing in the Germania, is a proof of the extent to which its greatness has diminished.

The Frank successors of Clovis, as well as Clovis himself, are often called *Sicambri*. In Gregory of Tours' account of the baptism of Clovis, the bishop says,—"Mitis depone colla, *Sicamber*, adora quod incendisti, incende quod adorasti."

Again—

Cum sis progenitus clara de gente *Sygamber*.
Venantius Fortunatus to King Charibert.

"In *Sicambrorum* natione rex nullus illi (*n.* Dagoberto) similis fuisse narraretur."—Vita S. Arnulphi.

In all these cases, however, the term is a titular *archaism*; no nation then being called *Sicambrian*.

Like *Cherusci*, then, *Sicambri* is a term which occurs during the early period of the history of the population to which it applied only.

Which of the two usual explanations of a fact of this

kind must we take; the extermination of the people, or the change of name?

The evidence in favour of the former view, is strong; Tiberius—"*Sicambros* dedentes se traduxit in Galliam atque in proximis Rheno agris collocavit."—Suet. Aug. 21.

Again,—"Germanico (bello) quadraginta millia dedititiorum trajecit in Galliam, juxtaque ripam Rheni sedibus assignatis collocavit."—Idem, Tib. 9.

Tiberius, speaking of himself, says, that, "Se novies a divo Augusto in Germaniam missum, plura consilio quam vi perfecisse; sic *Sicambros* in deditionem acceptos, sic Suevos."—Tac. Ann. ii. 26.

A stronger expression still occurs in another place:—"Ut quondam *Sicambri* excisi, et in Gallias trajecti forent, ita Silurum nomen penitus extinguendum."—Ann. xii. 39.

On the other hand,—

a. The name *Sicambri* was probably Gallic, since we find it in Cæsar. *Possibly*, it was *exclusively* so; in which case, the explanation is clear. It disappeared as soon as the Germans, to which it applied, became known by their German designations.

b. It was, perhaps, the *collective* name of a confederacy, consisting of *Gugerni*, *Gambrivii*, *Marsi*, and others; in which case it became obsolete when the confederacy was broken up.

I do not profess to see my way clearly here; or to be able to decide to even my own satisfaction. Neither can I explain the relation between the names Si-*cambri* (Su-*gambri*) and *Gambr*-ivii; for I think it would be unsafe to consider it accidental.

Besides this, there is a *Gambara*, conspicuous as a female leader, in the Langobard traditions.

And, besides this, the *Cimbri*.

And, besides this, the root *k-mp*=*fight*; so that *kæmpfer* =*fighting-man* (*champion*).

The syllable *si*-, both Zeuss and Grimm consider to represent the root *sig*=*victoria*; and as *gambar*=*strenuus*, *Si-gambri* = *Sig-gambri* = *strong for victory* = *sieg-tapfere*.

Without admitting this, I have nothing better to propose; though, at times, I have thought that the *si-*, *su-*, or *sy-*, might = the *su-* in *Su*-ssex, and the *Su*-gambri = *South* Gambrians.

At other times, it has looked like the *S-g*, in the name of the river *Sieg;* so that *Si-gambri* = *Gambrians of the Sieg.*

However, as long as there are fair reasons for believing it to be no German word at all, such guess-work is gratuitous.

The orthography of the name is varied. Although the *i* be short—

> "Te cæde gaudentes *Sicambri*,
> Compositis venerantur armis,"

the Greek form is *Σουγάμβροι,* with the diphthong, as in Strabo; though *Σύγαμβροι* in most MSS. of Ptolemy. The best form, perhaps, is *Sugambri.*

The locality of the *Sicambri* is that of the Franks of the Lower Rhine; the question as to whether the Frank history be a continuation of the Sicambrian, or the history of another population on the same ground, being involved in the questions just noticed, *viz.* the extent to which the disappearance of the name was nominal or real; referable to the extinction of the nation, or referable to the displacement of an old term by a new one; explained by the influence of an army, or explained by the influence of a synonym.

And this question stands open.

2. *The Gugerni of Tacitus, Guberni of Pliny.*—The present town of *Gellich* indicates the exact locality of this population.

In a document, A.D. 904, it has the form *Geldapa.*

In Tacitus, it is the well-known locality *Gelduba.*—Hist. iv. 26, v. 16, 18.

3. *Tubantes.*—"Chamavorum quondam ea arva, mox *Tubantum*, et post *Usipiorum.*"—Ann. xiii. 55.

Along with this should be taken from the following chapter, the notice of the—

4. *Ampsi-varii.*—"Sola *Ampsivariorum* gens retro ad Usipios et Tubantes concessit; quorum terris exacti cum Chattos, dein Cheruscos petiissent, errore longo, hospites, egeni, hostes in alieno, quod juventutis erat, cæduntur. Imbellis ætas in prædam divisa est."—Ibid. 56.

Now, the name of each of these populations gives their localities.

a. *Tu-bantes* is the oldest form of the Dutch district Tw-*ente*, in Overijsel.

b. *Ampsi-varii* = *Emis-wære*, occupants of the (Upper) *Ems*.

Both seem to have been on the *Cherusco-Frisian* frontier (perhaps as *Marchmen*), and, consequently, it is difficult to give them their exact ethnological position.

That considerable displacement occurred in these parts is certain. The annihilation of the *Ampsivarii* is not so.

The name re-appears in the fourth century—" Pauci ex *Ampsivariis* et Chattis, Marcomere duce, in ulterioribus collium jugis apparuere."—Sulpic. Alex. ap. Gregor. Turon. 2, 9.

The *Ampsivarii* of Tacitus are, almost certainly, the Ἀμψίανοι of Strabo. Whether they are also the Καμψίανοι of that writer is doubtful.—See *Epilegomena*,

5. *Caninefates*.—The locality now called *Kin*-heim, and *Ken*-mere in North Holland, is considered to retain the root *Can*- of the compound form ; the power of the final elements being unknown, and the evidence of the word being a compound at all being, consequently, inconclusive. Such, however, it probably is.

The Caninefates are mentioned in Hist. iv. 15, 16, 18.

They are closely connected with the Batavi ; a fact, which, as far as it goes, is in favour of that population being native rather than of *Hessian* origin.—See note in vv. *Subatti*, and § *Batti*, in *Epilegomena*.

A measure of the extent to which absolute and implicit faith is to be placed in each and every statement, of even so great a writer as Tacitus, is to found in his account of the Jews, whom he brings from Crete. Yet it was easier to write correctly about the Jews, than about the populations of Courland, Gallicia, and Poland.

§ II. THE DEA TACFANA.

A *dea Tacfana*, Ta*n*fana, or Ta*m*fana is mentioned as a local goddess of the Marsi.

No light has been thrown upon the nature of her *cultus*; indeed, the mention of her is a strong instance of the extent to which the German mythology of Tacitus is *not* the mythology of Germany, in the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries.

§ III. THE DEA HLUDANA.

In Cleves, a stone with the following inscription was dug up, and preserved at Xanten, DEAE HLUDANAE SACRUM C. TIBERIUS VERUS.

Mutatis mutandis what applies to the *dea Tacfana* applies to the *dea Hludana.*

§ IV. THE NOTICE OF GERMANY IN PTOLEMY.

THE German part of Ptolemy's geography is more truly a complement to the Germania of Tacitus, than any other work extant; since two areas, but slightly noticed by the Latin writer, are given by the Greek one with a fair amount of detail. These are,—

a. The country to the east of the Upper Rhine, wherein we find such new names as *Nertereanes*, *Danduti*, &c. = the *Hermanduri* of Suabia, Franconia, Baden, and Bavaria.

b. The parts to the north of the Elbe, *viz.*, Holstein, Sleswick, and Jutland, along with a portion of Scandinavia. This gives such names as *Sigulones*, *Phundusii*, &c.

It is, perhaps, almost superfluous to add, that Ptolemy is the first author who mentions the *Saxons* by that name.

As with Strabo, the names printed with their letters wider apart than usual, will be subjected to further notice in a special section (§).

GERMAN. LIB. II. C. XI.

8. Κατέχουσι δὲ τῆς Γερμανίας τὰ μὲν παρὰ τὸν Ῥῆνον ποταμὸν ἀρχομένοις ἀπ' ἄρκτων οἵ τε Βουσάκτεροι οἱ μικροὶ καὶ οἱ Σύγαμβροι.

9. Ὑφ' οὓς οἱ Σουῆβοι Λαγγοβάρδοι εἶτα Τ έ γ κ ε ρ ο ι καὶ

Ἰγκρίωνες μεταξύ τε Ῥήνου καὶ τῶν Ἀβνοβαίων ὀρέων· καὶ ἔτι Ἰντούεργοι καὶ Οὐαργίωνες καὶ Καριτνοί.

10. Ὑφ' οὓς Οὐισποὶ καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἐλουητίων ἔρημος μέχρι τῶν εἰρημένων Ἀλπίων ὀρέων.

11. Τὴν δὲ παρωκεανῖτιν κατέχουσιν ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Βουσακτέρους οἱ Φρίσσιοι μέχρι τοῦ Ἀμασίου ποταμοῦ· μετὰ δὲ τούτους Καῦχοι οἱ μικροὶ μέχρι τοῦ Οὐισούργιος ποταμοῦ· εἶτα Καῦχοι οἱ μείζους μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιος ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐχένα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσόνησον ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξονας Σιγούλωνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εἶτα Σαβαλίγγιοι, εἶτα Κοβανδοί.

12. Ὑπὲρ οὓς Χάλοι, καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδοῦσοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαροῦδες, πάντων δὲ ἀρκτικώτεροι Κίμβροι.

13. Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Σάξονας ἀπὸ τοῦ Χαλούσου ποταμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ Σουήβου ποταμοῦ Φαροδεινοί.

14. Εἶτα Σειδινοὶ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰαδούα ποταμοῦ, καὶ μετ' αὐτοὺς Ῥουτίκλειοι μέχρι τοῦ Οὐιστούλα ποταμοῦ.

15. Τῶν δὲ ἐντὸς καὶ μεσογείων ἐθνῶν μέγιστα μέν ἐστι τό, τε τῶν Σουήβων τῶν Ἀγγειλῶν, οἵ εἰσιν ἀνατολικώτεροι τῶν Λαγγοβάρδων ἀνατείνοντες πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους μέχρι τῶν μέσων τοῦ Ἄλβιος ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ τῶν Σουήβων τῶν Σεμνόνων, οἵτινες διήκουσι μετὰ τὸν Ἄλβιν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰρημένου μέρους πρὸς ἀνατολὰς μέχρι τοῦ Σουήβου ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ τῶν Βουγούντων τὰ ἐφεξῆς καὶ μέχρι τοῦ Οὐιστούλα κατεχόντων.

16. Ἐλάσσονα δὲ ἔθνη καὶ μεταξὺ κεῖνται — Καυχῶν μὲν τῶν μικρῶν καὶ τῶν Σουήβων Βουσάκτεροι οἱ μείζους ὑφ' οὓς Χαῖμαι· Καυχῶν δὲ τῶν μειζόνων καὶ τῶν Σουήβων Ἀγγριουάριοι·

17. Εἶτα Λαγγοβάρδοι· ὑφ' οὓς Δουλγούμνιοι· Σαξόνων δὲ καὶ τῶν Σουήβων Τευτονοάρ(ι)οι καὶ Οὐιροῦνοι, Φαροδεινῶν δὲ καὶ Σουήβων Τεύτονες καὶ Αὔαρποι· Ῥουτικλείων δὲ καὶ Βουγούντων Αἰλουαίωνες.

18. Πάλιν ὑπὸ μὲν τοὺς Σέμνονας οἰκοῦσι Σιλίγγαι, ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς Βουγοῦντας Λούγ(ι)οι οἱ Ὀμαννοί, ὑφ' οὓς Λούγ(ι)οι οἱ Δοῦνοι μέχρι τοῦ Ἀσκιβουργίου ὄρους.

19. Ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς Σιλίγγας Καλούκωνες ἐφ' ἑκάτερα τοῦ Ἄλβιος ποταμοῦ, ὑφ' οὓς Χαιρουσκοὶ καὶ Χαμαυοὶ μέχρι τοῦ Μηλιβόκου ὄρους.

20. Ὧν πρὸς ἀνατολὰς περὶ τὸν Ἄλβιν ποταμὸν Βαινοχαῖμαι, ὑπὲρ οὓς Βατεινοί, καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους ὑπὸ τὸ Ἀσκιβούργιον ὄρος Κορκοντοὶ καὶ Λούγ(ι)οι οἱ Βοῦροι μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Οὐιστούλα ποταμοῦ.

21. Ὑπὸ δὲ τούτους πρῶτοι Σίδωνες, εἶτα Κῶγνοι, εἶτα Οὐισβούργιοι ὑπὲρ τὸν Ὀρκύνιον δρυμόν.

22. Πάλιν ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν μὲν τῶν Ἀβνοβαίων ὀρῶν οἰκοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τοὺς Σουήβους Κασουάροι, εἶτα Νερτερέανες εἶτα Δανδοῦτοι, ὑφ' οὓς Τούρωνοι καὶ Μαρουίγγοι.

23. Ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς Χαμαυοὺς Χάτται, καὶ Τούβαντοι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ Σούδητα ὄρη Τευριοχαῖμαι, ὑπὸ δὲ τὰ ὄρη Οὐαριστοί.

24. Εἶτα ἡ Γαμβρήτα ὕλη, καὶ ὑπὸ μὲν τοὺς Μαρουίγγους Κουρίωνες, εἶτα Χαιτούωροι, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ Δανουβίου ποταμοῦ οἱ Παρμαικάμποι.

25. Ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν Γαμβρήταν ὕλην Μαρκομανοί, ὑφ' οὓς Σουδηνοί, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ Δανουβίου ποταμοῦ οἱ Ἀδραβαικάμποι.

26. Ὑπὸ δὲ τὸν Ὀρκύνιον δρυμὸν Κουάδοι, ὑφ' οὓς τὰ σιδηρωρυχεῖα καὶ ἡ Λοῦνα ὕλη, ὑφ' ἣν μέγα ἔθνος οἱ Βαῖμοι μέχρι τοῦ Δανουβίου, καὶ συνεχεῖς αὐτοῖς περὶ τὸν ποταμὸν οἱ Τερακατρίαι καὶ οἱ πρὸς τοῖς Κάμποις Ῥακάται.

§ V. EXTRACTS FROM JORNANDES *DE REBUS GETICIS*.

Jornandes, an Ostro-Goth by birth, was Bishop of Ravenna about A.D. 530. The following extracts are given, for the sake of showing the form which a mixture of tradition, speculation, and heterogeneous accounts of other populations, took in the hands of one of the first native Goths who attended to the antiquities of his nation.

Having premised it was from the bosom of a northern island named Scanzia, that his countrymen came, like a swarm of bees, into Europe, and after a reference to Ptolemy he continues—

In Scanzia vero insula, unde nobis sermo est, licet multæ et diversæ maneant nationes, septem tamen earum nomina meminit Ptolemæus. In cujus parte arctoa gens Adogit consistit, quæ fertur in æstate media quadraginta diebus et noctibus luces habere continuas; itemque brumali tempore, eodem dierum noctiumque numero lucem claram nescire. Ita alternato mœrore cum gaudio, beneficio aliis damnoque impar est. Et hoc quare? Quia prolixioribus diebus solem ad orientem per axis marginem vident redeuntem: brevioribus vero non sic conspicitur apud illos, sed aliter; quia Austrina signa percurrit, et qui nobis videtur sol ab imo surgere, illis per terræ marginem dicitur circuire. Aliæ vero ibi gentes Crefennæ, qui frumentorum non quæritant victum: sed carnibus ferarum atque avium vivunt. Ubi tanta paludibus fœtura ponitur, ut et augmentum præstent generi, et satietatem ac copiam genti. Alia vero gens ibi moratur Suethans, quæ velut Thuringi, equis utuntur eximiis. Hi quoque sunt, qui in usus Romanorum Saphirinas pelles commercio interveniente per alias innumeras gentes transmittunt, famosi pellium decora nigredine. Hi quum inopes vivunt, ditissimè vestiuntur. Sequuntur deinde diversarum turbæ nationum, Theusthes, Vagoth, Bergio, Hallin, Liothida, quorum omnium sedes sub humo plana ac fertili, et propterea inibi aliarum gentium incursionibus infestantur. Post hos Athelnil, Finnaithæ, Fervir, Gautigoth, acre hominum genus, et ad bella promptissimum. Dehinc mixti Evageræ Othingis. Hi omnes exesis rupibus, quasi castellis inhabitant, ritu beluino. Sunt ex his exteriores Ostrogothæ, Raumaricæ, Raugnaricii, Finni mitissimi, Scanziæ cultoribus omnibus mitiores: necnon et pares eorum Vinoviloth, Suethidi, Cogeni in hac gente reliquis corpore eminentiores, quamvis et Dani ex ipsorum stirpe progressi, Erulos propriis sedibus expulerunt: qui inter omnes Scanziæ nationes nomen sibi ob nimiam proceritatem affectant præcipuum. Sunt quanquam et illorum positura Grannii, Aganziæ, Unixæ, Ethelrugi, Arochiranni, quibus non ante omnes, sed ante multos annos Rodulf rex fuit: qui contempto proprio regno, ad Theoderici Gothorum regis gremium convolavit, et ut desiderabat, invenit. Hæ itaque gentes Romanis corpore et animo grandiores, infestæ sævitia pugnæ.

Ex hac igitur Scanzia insula, quasi officina gentium, aut certe velut vagina nationum, cum rege suo nomine Berich Gothi quondam memorantur egressi: qui ut primum e navibus exeuntes terras attigere, illico loco nomen dederunt. Nam hodie illic, ut fertur, Gothiscanzia vocatur. Unde mox promoventes ad sedes Ulmerugorum, qui tunc Oceani ripas insidebant, castrametati sunt, eosque commisso prœlio propriis sedibus pepulerunt: eorumque vicinos Wandalos jam tunc subjugantes, suis applicuere victoriis. Ibi vero magna populi numerositate crescente, etiam pene quinto rege regnante, post Berich, Filimer, filio Godarici, consilio sedit, ut exinde cum familiis Gothorum promoveret exercitus. Qui aptissimas sedes, locaque dum quæreret congrua, pervenit ad Scythiæ terras, quæ lingua eorum Ouin vocabantur. Ubi delectato magna ubertate regionum exercitu, et medietate transposita, pons dicitur, unde amnem transjecerat, miserabiliter corruisse, nec ulterius jam cuiquam licuit ire, aut redire. Nam is locus, ut fertur, tremulis paludibus voragine circumjecta concluditur: quem utraque confusione natura reddidit impervium. Veruntamen hodieque illic et voces armentorum audiri, et indicia hominum deprehendi, commeantium adtestatione, quamvis a longe audientium, credere licet. Hæc igitur pars Gothorum, quæ apud Filimer dicitur in terras Ouin emenso amne transposita, optatum potita solum: nec mora: illico ad gentem Spalorum adveniunt, consertoque prœlio victoriam adipiscuntur. Exindeque jam velut victores ad extremam Scythiæ partem, quæ Pontico mari vicina est, properant: quemadmodum et in priscis eorum carminibus pene historico ritu in commune recolitur: quod et Ablavius descriptor Gothorum gentis egregius verissima adtestatur historia. In quam sententiam et nonnulli consensere majorum. Josephus quoque annalium relator verissimus, dum ubique veritatis conservat regulam, et origines causarum a principio revolvit, hæc vero, quæ diximus, de gente Gothorum principia cur omiserit, ignoramus. Sed tamen ab hoc loco eorum stirpem commemorans, Scythas eos et natione et vocabulo asserit appellatos: cujus soli terminos, antequam aliud ad medium deducamus, necesse est, uti jaceant, dicere.

Scythia siquidem Germaniæ terræ confinis, eotenus ubi

Hister oritur amnis, vel stagnum dilatatur Mysianum, tendens usque ad flumina Tyram, Danastrum, et Vagosolam, magnumque illum Danubium, Taurumque montem, non illum Asiæ, sed proprium, id est Scythicum, per omnem Mæotidis ambitum, ultraque Mæotida, per angustias Bospori usque ad Caucasum montem, amnemque Araxem: ac deinde in sinistram partem reflexa, post mare Caspium, quæ in extremis Asiæ finibus ab Oceano Euroboreo, in modum fungi primum tenuis, post hæc latissima et rotunda forma exoritur, vergens ad Hunnos, Albanos, et Seres usque digreditur. Hæc inquam patria, id est Scythia, longe se tendens, lateque aperiens, habet ab oriente Seres, in ipso sui principio ad litus Caspii maris commanantes; ab occidente Germanos, et flumen Vistulæ; ab arctoo, id est septentrionali, circumdatur Oceano: a meridie Perside, Albania, Hiberia, Ponto, atque extremo alveo Histri, qui dicitur Danubius, ab ostio suo usque ad fontem. In eo vero loci latere, quo Ponticum litus attingit, oppidis haud obscuris involvitur, Boristhenide, Olbia, Callipode, Chersone, Theodosio, Pareone, Mirmycione, et Trapezunte: quas indomitæ Scytharum nationes Græcos permisere condere, sibimet commercia præstaturos. In cujus Scythiæ medio est locus, qui Asiam Europamque ab alterutro dividit. Riphæi scilicet montes, qui Tanaïn vastissimum fundunt intrantem Mæotida; cujus paludis circuitus passuum millia CXLIIII, nusquam octo ulnis altius subsidentis. In qua Scythia prima ab occidente gens sedit Gepidarum, quæ magnis opinatisque ambitur fluminibus. Nam Tisianus per aquilonem ejus corumque discurrit. Ab Africo vero magnus ipse Danubius, ab euro fluvius Tausis secat: qui rapidus ac verticosus in Histri fluenta furens devolvitur. Introrsus illi Dacia est, ad coronæ speciem arduis Alpibus emunita: juxta quorum sinistrum latus, quod in aquilonem vergit, et ab ortu Vistulæ fluminis per immensa spatia venit, Winidarum natio populosa consedit. Quorum nomina licet nunc per varias familias et loca mutentur, principaliter tamen Sclavini et Antes nominantur. Sclavini a civitate nova, et Sclavino Rumunnense, et lacu qui appellatur Musianus, usque ad Danastrum, et in boream Viscla tenus commorantur: hi paludes sylvasque pro civitatibus habent. Antes vero, qui sunt eorum fortissimi,

qui ad Ponticum mare curvantur, a Danastro extenduntur usque ad Danubium: quæ flumina multis mansionibus ab invicem absunt. Ad litus autem Oceani, ubi tribus faucibus fluenta Vistulæ fluminis ebibuntur, Vidioarii resident, ex diversis nationibus aggregati. Post quos ripam Oceani Itemesti tenent, pacatum hominum genus omnino. Quibus in austro adsedit gens Agazzirorum fortissima, frugum ignara, quæ pecoribus et venationibus victitat. Ultra quos distenduntur supra mare Ponticum Bulgarorum sedes, quos notissimos peccatorum nostrorum mala fecere. Hinc jam Hunni, quasi fortissimarum gentium fœcundissimus cespes, in bifariam populorum rabiem pullularunt. Nam alii Aulziagri, alii Auiri nuncupantur, qui tamen sedes habent diversas. Juxta Chersonem Aulziagri, quo Asiæ bona avidus mercator importat, qui æstate campos pervagantur effusos, sedes habentes, prout armentorum invitaverint pabula; hyeme supra mare Ponticum se referentes. Hunugari autem hinc sunt noti, quia ab ipsis pellium murinarum venit commercium: quos tantorum virorum formidavit audacia. Quorum mansionem primam esse in Scythiæ solo, juxta paludem Mæotidem, secundo in Mœsia, Thraciaque, et Dacia, tertio supra mare Ponticum, rursus in Scythia legimus habitasse: nec eorum fabulas alicubi reperimus scriptas, qui eos dicunt in Britannia, vel in una qualibet insularum in servitutem redactos, et unius caballi pretio quondam redemptos. Aut certe si quis eos aliter dixerit in nostro orbe, quam quod nos diximus, fuisse exortos, nobis aliquid obstrepit: nos enim potius lectioni credimus, quam fabulis anilibus consentimus. Ut ergo ad nostrum propositum redeamus, in prima parte Scythiæ juxta Mæotidem commanentes præfati, unde loquimur, Filimer regem habuisse noscuntur. In secundo, id est, Daciæ, Thraciæque et Mœsiæ solo Zamolxen, quem miræ philosophicæ eruditionis fuisse testantur plerique scriptores annalium. Nam et Zeutam prius habuerunt eruditum, post etiam Diceneum, tertium Zamolxen, de quo superius diximus. Nec defuerunt, qui eos sapientiam erudirent. Unde et pene omnibus barbaris Gothi sapientiores semper extiterunt, Græcisque pene consimiles, ut refert Dio, qui historias eorum annalesque Græco stilo composuit. Qui dixit primum Tarabosteos, deinde vocitatos Pileatos hos, qui

inter eos generosi extabant; ex quibus eis et reges, et sacerdotes ordinabantur. Adeo ergo fuere laudati Getæ, ut dudum Martem, quem poetarum fallacia deum belli pronunciat, apud eos fuisse dicant exortum. Unde et Virgilius,

> "Gradivumque patrem, Geticis qui præsidet arvis."

Quem Martem Gothi semper asperrima placavere cultura. Nam victimæ ejus mortes fuere captorum, opinantes bellorum præsulem aptius humani sanguinis effusione placandum. Huic prædæ primordia vovebantur, huic truncis suspendebantur exuviæ: eratque illis religionis præter cæteros insinuatus affectus, quum parenti devotio nominis videretur impendi. Tertia vero sedes supra mare Ponticum. Jam humaniores, et, ut superius diximus, prudentiores effecti, divisi per familias populi, Wesegothæ familiæ Balthorum, Ostrogothæ præclaris Amalis serviebant. Quorum studium fuit primum, inter alias gentes vicinas, arcus intendere nervis; Lucano, plus historico quam poeta, testante,

> "Armeniosque arcus Geticis intendere nervis."

Ante quos etiam cantu majorum facta modulationibus citharisque canebant, Ethespamaræ, Hanalæ, Fridigerni, Widiculæ, et aliorum, quorum in hac gente magna opinio est, quales vix heroas fuisse miranda jactat antiquitas. Tunc, ut fertur, Vesoces Scythis lachrymabile sibi potius intulit bellum, eis videlicet, quos Amazonum viros prisca tradit auctoritas. De queis feminas bellatrices et Orosius in primo volumine professa voce testatur. Unde cum Gothis eum dimicasse evidenter probamus, quem cum Amazonum viris absolute pugnasse cognoscimus: qui tunc a Boristhene amne, quem accolæ Danubium vocant, usque ad Tanaïn fluvium, circa sinum paludis Mæotidis considebant. Tanaïn vero hunc dico, qui ex Ripheis montibus dejectus adeo præceps ruit, ut quum vicina flumina, sive Mæotis, vel Bosporus gelu solidentur, solus amnium confragosis montibus vaporatus, nunquam Scythico durescit algore. Hic inter Asiam Europamque terminus famosus habetur: nam alter est ille, qui montibus Chrinnorum oriens, in Caspium mare dilabitur. Danubius autem ortus grandi palude, quasi ex mari profunditur. Hic usque ad

medium sui dulcis est et potabilis, piscesque nimii saporis gignit, ossibus carentes, cartilaginem tantum habentes in corporis continentiam. Sed ubi fit Ponto vicinior, parvum fontem suscipit, cui* ex Ampheo cognomen est, adeo amarum, ut cum sit XL. dierum itinere navigabilis, hujus aquis exiguis immutetur, infestusque ac dissimilis sui, inter Græca oppida Callipidas et Hipanis, in mare defluat. Ad cujus ostia insula est in fronte, Achillis nomine. Inter hos terra vastissima, silvis consita, paludibus dubia.

Hic ergo Gothis morantibus, Vesoces Ægyptiorum rex in bellum irruit: quibus tunc Taunasis rex erat. Quo prœlio ad Phasim fluvium, a quo Phasides aves exortæ, in toto mundo eduliis potentum exuberant, Taunasis Gothorum rex Vesoci Ægyptiorum occurrit, eumque graviter debellans, in Ægyptum usque persecutus est: et nisi Nili amnis intransmeabilis obstitissent fluenta, vel munitiones, quas dudum sibi, ob incursiones Æthiopum Vesocis fieri præcepisset, ibi in ejus eum patria extinxisset. Sed dum eum semper ibi positum non valuisset lædere, revertens pene omnem Asiam subjugavit, et sibi tunc caro amico Sorno rege Medorum ad persolvendum tributum, subditum fecit. Ex cujus exercitu victores tunc nonnulli provincias subditas contuentes, et in omni fertilitate pollentes, deserto suorum agmine sponte in Asiæ partibus resederunt. Ex quorum nomine vel genere Trogus Pompeius Parthorum dicit extitisse prosapiam. Unde etiam hodieque lingua Scythica fugaces, quod est Parthi, dicuntur: suoque generi respondentes, inter omnes pene Asiæ nationes soli sagittarii sunt, et acerrimi bellatores. De nomine vero, quod diximus eos Parthos, id est fugaces, ita aliquanti etymologiam traxerunt, ut dicerentur Parthi, quia suos refugere parentes. Hunc ergo Taunasim regem Gothorum mortuum inter numina sui populi coluerunt.

Post cujus decessum exercitu ejus cum successore ipsius in aliis partibus expeditionem gerente, feminæ Gothorum a quadam vicina gente tentatæ, in prædamque ductæ a viris, fortiter restiterunt, hostesque super se venientes cum magna verecundia abegerunt. Qua parata victoria, fretæque majori audacia, invicem se cohortantes, arma arripiunt, eligentesque

* Compare Herodotus, iv. 52.

duas audaciores Lampeto* et Marpesiam principatui subrogarunt. Quæ dum curam gerunt, ut propria defenderent, et aliena vastarent, sortito Lampeto restitit, fines patrios tuendo. Marpesia vero feminarum agmine sumpto, novum genus exercitus duxit in Asiam, diversasque gentes bello superans, alias vero pace concilians, ad Caucasum venit: ibique certum tempus demorans, loco nomen dedit, Saxum Marpesiæ. Unde Virgilius,

"Quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes."

In eo loco ubi post hæc Alexander Magnus portas constituens, Pylas Caspias nominavit: quod nunc Lazorum gens custodit pro munitione Romana. Hic ergo certum temporis Amazones commanentes confortatæ sunt. Unde egressæ, et Alym fluvium, qui juxta Gargarum civitatem præterfluit, transeuntes, Armeniam, Syriam, Ciliciamque, Galatiam, Pisidiam, omniaque Asiæ oppida, æqua felicitate domuerunt: Ionium, Æoliamque conversæ, deditas sibi provincias effecerunt. Ubi diutius dominantes, etiam civitates castraque suo nomini dicaverunt. Ephesi quoque templum Dianæ, ob sagittandi venandique studium, quibus se artibus tradidissent, effusis opibus, miræ pulchritudinis condiderunt. Tali ergo Scythicæ gentis feminæ casu Asiæ regno potitæ, per centum pene annos tenuerunt, et sic demum ad proprias socias in cautes Marpesias, quas superius diximus, repedarunt, in montem scilicet Caucasum. Cujus montis, quia facta iterum mentio est, non ab re arbitror ejus tractum situmque describere, quando maximam partem orbis noscitur circuire jugo continuo. Caucasus ab Indico mari surgens, qua meridiem respicit, sole vaporatus ardescit. Qua septentrioni patet, rigentibus ventis est obnoxius et pruinis. Mox in Syriam curvato angulo reflexus, licet amnium plurimos emittat, in Asianam tamen regionem Eufratem Tigrimque navigeros, ad opinionem maximam perennium fontium, copiosis fundit uberibus. Qui amplexantes terras Assyriorum, Mesopotamiam appellari faciunt, et videri; in sinum maris Rubri fluenta deponentes. Tunc in boream revertens, Scythias terras, jugum ántefatum magnis flexibus pervagatur: atque ibidem opinatissima flumina in Caspium mare profundens, Araxem, Cyssum, et Cambysen, continuato

* This is the name of one of the viragoes of the *Lysistrata*.

jugo ad Ripheos usque montes extenditur. Indeque Scythicis gentibus dorso suo terminum præbens, ad Pontum usque descendit: consertisque collibus, Histri quoque fluenta contingit, quo amnis scissus dehiscens, in Scythia quoque Taurus vocatur. Talis ergo tantusque, et pene omnium maximus, excelsas suas erigens summitates, naturali constructioni præstat gentibus inexpugnanda munimina. Nam locatim rescisus, qua disrupto jugo vallis hiatu patescit, nunc Caspias portas, nunc Armenias, nunc Cilicas, vel secundum locum qualis fuerit, facit; vix tamen plaustro meabilis, lateribus in altitudinem utrimque directis, qui pro gentium varietate diverso vocabulo nuncupatur. Hunc enim Iamnium, mox Propanismum Indus appellat. Parthus primum Castra, post Nifacen edicit. Syrus et Armenius Taurum; Scythæ Caucasum ac Ripheum, iterumque in fine Taurum cognominant: aliaque complura gentes huic jugo dedere vocabula. Et quia de ejus continuatione pauca libavimus, ad Amazones, unde divertimus, redeamus.

Veritæ hæ, ne earum proles raresceret, a vicinis gentibus concubitum petierunt; facta nundina semel in anno, ita ut futuris temporibus eis deinde revertentibus in idipsum, quicquid partus masculini edidisset, patri redderet: quicquid vero feminei sexus nasceretur, mater ad arma bellica erudiret. Sive, ut quibusdam placet, editis maribus, novercali odio infantis miserandi fata rumpebant: ita apud illas detestabile puerperium erat, quod ubique constat esse votivum. Quæ crudelitas illis terrorem magnum cumulabat, opinione vulgata. Nam quæ, rogo, spes esset capto, ubi ignosci vel filio nefas habebatur? Contra has, ut fertur, pugnabat Hercules; et Melanes pene plus dolo, quam virtute subegit. Theseus vero Hippoliten in prædam tulit, de qua genuit et Hippolytum. Hæ quoque Amazones post hæc habuere reginam nomine Penthesileam, cujus Trojano bello extant clarissima documenta. Nam hæ feminæ usque ad Alexandrum Magnum referuntur tenuisse regnum.

Sed ne dicas, de viris Gothorum sermo adsumptus, cur in feminis tamdiu perseveret: audi et virorum insignem et laudabilem et fortitudinem. Dio historicus, et antiquitatum diligentissimus inquisitor, qui operi suo Getica titulum dedit (quos Getas jam superiori loco Gothos esse probavimus,

Orosio Paulo dicente); hic Dio regem illis post tempora multa commemorat, nomine Telephum. Ne vero quis dicat hoc nomen a lingua Gothica omnino peregrinum esse, nemo est qui nesciat animadverti, usu pleraque nomina gentes amplecti, ut Romani Macedonum, Græci Romanorum, Sarmatæ Germanorum, Gothi plerumque mutuantur Hunnorum. Is ergo Telephus Herculis filius, natus ex Auge sorore Priami, conjugio copulatus, procerus quidem corpore, sed plus vigore terribilis, paternam fortitudinem propriis virtutibus æquans, Herculis genio formæ quoque similitudinem referebat. Hujus itaque regnum Mœsiam appellavere majores. Quæ provincia ab oriente ostia fluminis Danubii, a meridie Macedoniam, ab occasu Histriam, a septentrione Danubium habet. Is ergo antefatus habuit bellum cum Danais, in qua pugna Thessandrum ducem Græciæ interemit; et dum Ajacem infestus invadit, Ulyssemque persequitur, equo cadente, ipse corruit, Achillisque jaculo femore sauciatus, diu mederi nequivit: Græcos tamen, quamvis jam saucius, e suis finibus proturbavit. Telepho vero defuncto, Eurypilus filius successit in regno, ex Priami Phrygum regis germana progenitus. Qui ob Cassandræ amorem bello interesse Trojano, ac parentibus soceroque ferre auxilium cupiens, mox ut venit extinctus est.

Cyrus rex Persarum post grande intervallum, et pene post sexcentorum triginta annorum tempora, Pompeio Trogo testante, Getarum reginæ Tamiri, sibi exitiale, intulit bellum. Qui elatus ex Asiæ victoria, Getas nititur subjugare; in quibus (ut diximus) regnaverat Tamiris. Quæ cum ab Araxe amne Cyri arcere potuisset accessus, transire tamen permisit, eligens armis eum vincere, quam locorum beneficio submovere: quod et factum est. Et veniente Cyro, prima cessit fortuna Parthis tanta, ut et filium Tamiris, et plurimum exercitum trucidarent. Sed iterato Marte, Getæ cum sua regina Parthos devictos superant atque prosternunt, opimamque prædam de eis auferunt: ibique primum Gothorum gens serica vident tentoria. Tunc Tamiris regina nacta victoria, tantaque præda de inimicis potita, in partem Mœsiæ (quæ nunc ex magna Scythia nomen mutuata, minor Scythia est appellata) transiens, ibi in ponte Mœsiæ colitur, et Tamiris civitatem suo de nomine ædificavit. Dehinc Darius rex Persarum,

Hystaspis filius, Antyri regis Gothorum filiam in matrimonium expostulavit, rogans pariter atque deterrens, nisi suam peragerent voluntatem. Cujus affinitatem Gothi spernentes, legationem ejus frustrarunt. Qui repulsus, furore flammatus est, et octoginta millia armatorum contra ipsos produxit exercitum, verecundiam suam malo publico vindicare contendens; navibusque pene a Chalcedonia usque ad Byzantium, ad instar pontium tabulatis atque consertis, petit Thraciam et Mœsiam; ponteque rursus in Danubio pari modo constructo duobus mensibus crebris fatigatus intaphis, octo millia perdidit armatorum. Timensque ne pons Danubii ab ejus adversariis occuparetur, celeri fuga in Thraciam repedavit: nec Mœsiæ solum credens sibi tutum fore aliquantum remorandi. Post cujus decessum iterum Xerxes filius ejus paternas injurias ulcisci se æstimans, cum suis ducentis, et auxiliatorum trecentis millibus armatorum, rostratas naves habens mille septingentas, et onerarias tria millia, super Gothos profectus ad bellum; nec tentata re in conflictu prævaluit, animositate constantiæ superatus. Sic namque ut venerat, absque aliquo certamine suo cum rubore recessit. Philippus quoque pater Alexandri Magni cum Gothis amicitias copulans, Medopam Gothilæ filiam regis accepit uxorem, ut tali affinitate roboratus, Macedonum regna firmaret. Qua tempestate, Dione historico dicente, Philippus inopiam pecuniæ passus, Udisitanam Mœsiæ civitatem instructis copiis vastare deliberat, quæ tunc propter viciniam Tamiris, Gothis erat subjecta. Unde et sacerdotes Gothorum aliqui, illi qui Pii vocabantur, subito patefactis portis cum citharis et vestibus candidis obviam sunt egressi paternis diis, ut sibi propitii Macedones repellerent, voce supplici modulantes. Quos Macedones sic fiducialiter sibi occurrere contuentes, stupescunt; et si dici fas est, ab inermibus tenentur armati. Nec mora, acie soluta, quam ad bellum construxerunt, non tantum ab urbis excidio removere; verum etiam et quos foris fuerunt jure belli adepti, reddiderunt, fœdereque inito ad sua reversi sunt. Quem dolum post longum tempus reminiscens egregius Gothorum ductor Sitalcus, CL. virorum millibus congregatis, Atheniensibus intulit bellum, adversus Perdiccam Macedoniæ regem, quem Alexander apud Babyloniam ministri insidiis potans interitum,

Atheniensium principatui hereditario jure reliquerat successorem. Magno prælio cum hoc inito, Gothi superiores inventi sunt: et sic pro injuria, quam illi in Mœsia dudum fecissent, isti in Græciam discurrentes, cunctam Macedoniam vastavere.

* * * * *

Tum Gothi haud segnes reperti, arma capessunt, primoque armati conflictu mox Romanos devincunt: Fuscoque duce extincto, divitias de castris militum despoliant, magnaque potiti per loca victoria, jam proceres suos quasi qui fortuna vincebant, non puros homines, sed semideos, id est Anses vocavere. Quorum genealogiam paucis percurram; ut quo quis parente genitus est, aut unde origo accepta, ubi finem efficit, absque invidia qui legis, vera dicentem ausculta.

Horum ergo (ut ipsi suis fabulis ferunt) primus fuit Gapt, qui genuit Halmal; Halmal vero genuit Augis; Augis genuit eum, qui dictus est Amala, a quo et origo Amalorum decurrit. Et Amala genuit Isarnam; Isarna autem genuit Ostrogotham; Ostrogotha genuit Unilt; Unilt genuit Athal; Athal genuit Achiulf; Achiulf genuit Ansilam et Ediulf, Vuldulf, et Hermenrich; Vuldulf vero genuit Valeravans; Valeravans autem genuit Winitharium; Winitharius quoque genuit Theodemir et Walemir et Widemir; Theodemir genuit Theodericum; Theodericus genuit Amalasuentam; Amalasuenta genuit Athalaricum et Mathasuentam, de Widerico viro suo, cujus affinitati generis sic ad eam conjunctus est. Nam supradictus Hermenricus, filius Achiulfi, genuit Hunnimundum; Hunnimundus autem genuit Thorismundum; Thorismundus vero genuit Berimundum; Berimundus genuit Widericum; Widericus genuit Eutharicum; qui conjunctus Amalasuentæ genuit Athalaricum et Mathasuentam; mortuoque in pueribus annis Athalarico, Mathasuentæ Witichis est sociatus, de quo non suscepit liberum: adductique simul a Belisario in Constantinopolim, et Witichi rebus excedente humanis, Germanus patricius, fratruelis domini Justiniani Imperatoris, eandem in conjugio sumens, patriciam ordinariam fecit; de qua filium genuit, item Germanum nomine. Germano vero defuncto, ipsa vidua perseverare disponit. Qualiter autem, aut quomodo Amalorum regnum destructum est, loco suo (si Dominus voluerit) edocebimus. Nunc autem ad id,

unde digressum fecimus, redeamus, doceamusque quando ordo gentis, unde agimus, cursus sui metam expleverit. Ablavius enim historicus refert, quia ibi super limbum Ponti, ubi eos diximus in Scythia commanere, pars eorum, qui orientalem plagam tenebant, eisque præerat Ostrogotha (incertum utrum ab ipsius nomine, an a loco orientali) dicti sunt Ostrogothæ, residui vero Wesegothæ in parte occidua. Et quidem jam diximus, eos transito Danubio aliquantum temporis apud Mœsiam, Thraciamque vixisse.

* * * * *

Ab hinc ergo, ut dicebamus, post longam obsidionem accepto præmio ditatus Geta, recessit ad patriam. Quem Gepidarum cernens natio subito ubique vincentem, prædisque ditatum, invidia ductus, arma in parentes movet. Quomodo vero Getæ Gepidæque sint parentes si quæris, paucis absolvam. Meminisse debes, me initio de Scanziæ insulæ gremio Gothos dixisse egressos cum Berich suo rege, tribus tantum navibus vectos ad citerioris Oceani ripam; quarum trium una navis, ut assolet, tardius vecta, nomen genti fertur dedisse; nam lingua eorum pigra *Gepanta* dicitur. Hinc factum est, ut paullatim et corrupte nomen eis ex convitio nasceretur. Gepidæ namque sine dubio ex Gothorum prosapia ducunt originem: sed quia, ut dixi, Gepanta pigrum aliquid tardumque signat, pro gratuito convitio Gepidarum nomen exortum est, quod nec ipsum; credo falsissimum. Sunt enim tardioris ingenii, graviores corporum velocitate. Hi ergo Gepidæ tacti invidia, dudum spreta provincia, commanebant in insula Visclæ amnis vadis circumacta, quam pro patrio sermone dicebant Gepidos. Nunc eam, ut fertur, insulam gens Vividaria incolit, ipsis ad meliores terras meantibus. Qui Vividarii ex diversis nationibus acsi in unum asylum collecti sunt, et gentem fecisse noscuntur.

* * * * *

Gothorum rege Geberich rebus excedente humanis, post temporis aliquod Hermanricus nobilissimus Amalorum, in regno successit: qui multas et bellicosissimas arctoas gentes perdomuit, suisque parere legibus fecit. Quem merito nonnulli Alexandro Magno comparavere majores. Habebat siquidem quos domuerat, Gothos, Scythas, Thuidos, Inaunxis,

Vasinabroncas, Merens, Mordensimnis, Caris, Rocas, Tadzans, Athual, Navego, Bubegentas, Coldas; et cum tantorum servitio carus haberetur, non passus est nisi et gentem Herulorum, quibus præerat Alaricus, magna ex parte trucidatam, reliquam suæ subigeret ditioni. Nam prædicta gens (Ablavio historico referente) juxta Mæotidas paludes habitans in locis stagnantibus, quas Græci Hele vocant, Heruli nominati sunt: gens quanto velox, eo amplius superbissima. Nulla siquidem erat tunc gens, quæ non levem armaturam in acie sua ex ipsis elegerint. Sed quamvis velocitas eorum ab aliis sæpe bellantibus eos tutaretur, Gothorum tamen stabilitati subjacuit et tarditati: fecitque causa fortunæ, ut et ipsi inter reliquas gentes Getarum regi Hermanrico servierint. Post Herulorum cædam idem Hermanricus in Venetos arma commovit; qui quamvis armis desperiti, sed numerositate pollentes, primo resistere conabantur. Sed nihil valet multitudo in bello, præsertim ubi et Deus permittit, et multitudo fortium armata advenerit. Nam hi, ut initio expositionis, vel catalogo gentis dicere cœpimus, ab una stirpe exorti tria nunc nomina reddidere, id est Veneti, Antes, Sclavi: qui quamvis nunc ita facientibus peccatis nostris ubique desæviunt, tamen tunc omnes Hermanrici imperiis serviere. Hæstorum quoque similiter nationem, qui longissimam ripam Oceani Germanici insident, idem ipse prudentia virtute subegit, omnibusque Scythiæ et Germaniæ nationibus, acsi propriis laboribus, imperavit.

Post autem non longi temporis intervallum, ut refert Orosius, Hunnorum gens omni ferocitate atrocior exarsit in Gothos: eosque qui prius timori erant cæteris gentibus, ab antiquis conterritos pepulit sedibus. Nam hos, ut refert antiquitas, ita extitisse comperimus. Filimer rex Gothorum, et Gandarici magni filius, post egressum Scanziæ insulæ jam quinto loco tenens principatum Getarum, qui et terras Scythicas cum sua gente introisset, sicut a nobis dictum est, repperit in populo suo quasdam magas mulieres, quas patrio sermone Alyrunnas is ipse cognominat, easque habens suspectas de medio sui proturbat, longeque ab exercitu suo fugatas in solitudine coegit errare. Quas silvestres homines, quos Faunos Ficarios vocant, per eremum vagantes dum vidissent, et earum se complexibus in coitu miscuissent, genus

hoc ferocissimum edidere; quod fuit primum inter paludes Mæotidas minutum, tetrum, atque exile, quasi inhumanum genus, nec alia voce notum, nisi quod humani sermonis imaginem assignabat. Tali ergo Hunni stirpe creati, Gothorum finibus advenere. Quorum natio sæva, ut priscus historicus refert, in Mæotide palude ulteriorem ripam insedit: venatione tantum, nec alio labore experta, nisi quod postquam crevisset in populos, fraudibus et rapinis vicinam gentem conturbavit. Hujus ergo (ut assolent) venatores, dum in ulteriori Mæotidis ripa venationes inquirunt, animadvertunt quomodo ex improviso cerva se illis obtulit, ingressaque palude nunc progrediens, nunc subsistens, indicem se viæ tribuit. Quam secuti venatores, paludem Mæotidem, quam imperviam ut pelagus existimabant, pedibus transiere. Mox quoque ut Scythica terra ignotis apparuit, cerva disparuit. Quod credo spiritus illi, unde progeniem trahunt, ad Scytharum invidiam egere. Illi vero, qui præter Mæotidem paludem alium mundum esse penitus ignorabant, admiratione inducti terræ Scythiæ, et ut sunt solertes, iter illud nulli ante hanc ætatem notissimum, divinitus sibi ostensum rati, ad suos redeunt, rei gestum edicunt, Scythiam laudant, persuasaque gente sua, via quam cerva indice didicere, ad Scythiam properant, et quantoscunque prius in ingressu Scytharum habuere, litavere victoriæ, reliquos perdomitos subegere. Nam mox ingentem illam paludem transiere, ilico Alipzuros, Alcidzuros, Itamaros, Tinicassos, et Boiscos, qui ripæ istius Scythiæ insidebant, quasi quidam turbo gentium rapuere. Alanos quoque pugna sibi pares, sed immanitate victus, formaque dissimiles, frequenti certamine fatigantes subjugavere. Nam et quos bello forsitan minime superabant, vultus sui terrore nimium pavorem ingerentes fugabant: eo quod erat eis species pavendæ nigredinis, et velut quædam (si dici fas est) deformis offa, non facies, habensque magis puncta, quam lumina. Quorum animi fiduciam torvus prodit aspectus: qui etiam in pignora sua primo die nata desæviunt. Nam maribus ferro genas secant, ut antequam lactis nutrimenta percipiant, vulneris cogantur subire tolerantiam. Hinc imberbes senescunt, et sine venustate ephebi sunt; quia facies ferro sulcata, tempestivam pilorum gratiam per cicatrices absumit. Exigui quidem forma, sed

arguti, motibus expediti, et ad equitandum promptissimi: scapulis latis, et ad arcus sagittasque parati: firmis crevicibus, et superbia semper erecti. Hi vero sub hominum figura vivunt beluina sævitia. Quod genus expeditissimum, multarumque nationum grassatorium, Getæ ut viderunt, expavescunt: suoque cum rege diliberant, qualiter se a tali hoste subducant. Nam Hermanricus rex Gothorum, licet (ut superius retulimus) multarum gentium extiterit triumphator, de Hunnorum tamen adventu dum cogitat, Roxolanorum gens infida, quæ tunc inter alias famulatum exhibebat, tali eum nanciscitur occasione decipere. Dum enim quandam mulierem Sanielh nomine ex gente memorata, pro mariti fraudulento discessu, rex furore commotus, equis ferocibus illigatam, incitatisque cursibus per diversa divelli præcipisset, fratres ejus Sarus et Ammius germanæ obitum vindicantes, Hermanrici latus ferro petierunt: quo vulnere saucius, ægram vitam corporis imbecillitate contraxit. Quam adversam ejus valetudinem captans Balamir rex Hunnorum, in Ostrogothas movit procinctum: a quorum societate jam Wesegothæ discessere, quam dudum inter se juncti habebant. Inter hæc Hermanricus tam vulneris dolorem, quam etiam incursiones Hunnorum non ferens, grandævus et plenus dierum, centesimodecimo anno vitæ suæ defunctus est. Cujus mortis occasio dedit Hunnis prævalere in Gothos illos, quos dixeramus orientali plaga sedere, et Ostrogothas nuncupari.

Wesegothæ id est, alii eorum socii, et occidui soli cultores, metu parentum exterriti, quidnam de se, propter gentem Hunnorum deliberarent, ambigebant: diuque cogitantes, tandem communi placito legatos ad Romaniam direxere, ad Valentem Imperatorem, fratrem Valentiniani Imperatoris senioris, ut partem Thraciæ sive Mœsiæ si illis traderet ad colendum, ejus legibus viverent, ejusque imperiis subderentur.

After this, the narrative becomes properly historical, giving the history of the Goths of Mœsia.

§ VI. EXTRACT FROM PAULUS DIACONUS *DE GESTIS LONGOBARDORUM.*

Paul, the son of Warnefrid (*Paulus Warnefridi filius*, as he is often designated), was deacon of Friuli, and secretary to Desiderius, the last king of the Lombards. To the traditions and history of those conquerors, his work bears the same relation, which that of Jornandes does to those of the Ostro-Goths.

LIB. I.

I. Septentrionalis plaga, quanto magis ab æstu solis remota est, et nivali frigore gelida, tanto salubrior corporibus hominum, et propagandis est gentibus magis coaptata: sicut e contra omnis meridiana regio, quo solis est fervori vicinior, eo semper morbis abundat, et educandis minus est apta mortalibus. Unde fit ut tantæ populorum multitudines arctoo sub axe oriantur: ut non immerito universa illa regio Tanai tenus, usque ad occiduum, licet et propriis loca in ea singula nuncupentur nominibus, generali tamen vocabulo Germania vocitetur; quamvis et duas ultra Rhenum provincias Romani, cum ea loca occupassent, superiorem inferioremque Germaniam dixerint. Ab hac ergo populosa Germania, sæpe innumerabiles captivorum turmæ abductæ, meridianis populis pretio distrahuntur. Multæ quoque ex ea, pro eo quod tantos mortalium germinat, quantos alere vix sufficit, sæpe gentes egressæ sunt, quæ nihilominus et partes Asiæ, sed maxime sibi contiguam Europam, afflixerunt. Testantur hoc ubique urbes erutæ, per totam Illyricum Galliamque: sed maxime miseræ Italiæ, quæ pene omnium illarum est gentium experta sævitiam. Gothi siquidem, Wandalique, Rugi, Heruli, atque Turcilingi, nec non etiam aliæ feroces et barbaræ nationes, e Germania prodierunt.

II. Pari etiam modo et Winilorum, hoc est, Longobardorum gens, quæ postea in Italia feliciter regnavit, a Germanorum populis originem ducens, licet et aliæ causæ egressionis eorum asseverentur, ab insula quæ Scandinavia dicitur adventavit: cujus etiam insulæ, Plinius Secundus in libris, quos De Natura Rerum composuit, mentionem facit. Hæc ergo insula,

sicut retulerunt nobis, qui eam lustraverunt, non tam in mari est posita, quam marinis fluctibus, propter planitiem marginum, terras ambientibus circumfusa. Intra hanc ergo constituti populi, dum in tantam multitudinem pullulassent, ut jam simul habitare non valerent, in tres, ut fertur, omnem catervam partes dividentes, quæ ex illis pars patriam relinquere, novasque deberet sedes exquirere, sorte perquirit.

III. Igitur ea pars, cui sors dederat genitale solum excedere, exteraque arva sectari, ordinatis super se duobus ducibus, Ibor scilicet et Ayone, qui et germani erant, et juvenili adhuc ætate floridi, et cæteris præstantiores, ad exquirendas quas possint incolere terras, sedesque statuere, valedicentes suis simul et patriæ, iter arripiunt. Horum erat ducum mater nomine Gambara, mulier quantum inter suos et ingenio acris, et consiliis provida; de cujus in rebus dubiis prudentia non minimum confidebant.

IV. Haud ab re esse arbitror, paulisper narrandi ordinem postponere, et quia adhuc stylus in Germania vertitur, miraculum quod illic apud omnes celebre habetur, sed et quædam alia breviter intimare. In extremis Circium versus Germaniæ finibus, in ipso Oceani litore, antrum sub eminenti rupe conspicitur, ubi septem viri (incertum ex quo tempore) longo sopiti sopore quiescunt, ita inlæsis non solum corporibus, sed etiam vestimentis, ut ex hoc ipso, quod sine ulla per tot annorum curricula corruptione perdurant, apud indociles easdam et barbaras nationes, venerationi habeantur. Hi denique quantum ad habitum spectat, Romani esse cernuntur. E quibus dum unum quidam cupiditate stimulatus vellet exuere, mox ejus ut dicitur brachia aruerunt, pœnaque sua cæteros perterruit, ne quis eos ulterius contingere auderet. Videris ad quem eos profectum, per tot tempora providentia divina conservet. Fortasse horum quandoque, quia non aliter nisi Christiani esse putantur, gentes illæ prædicatione salvandæ sunt.

V. Huic loco Scritobini (sic enim gens illa nominatur) vicini sunt, qui etiam æstatis tempore nivibus non carent, nec aliis, utpote feris ipsis ratione non dispares, quam crudis agrestium animantium carnibus vescuntur; de quorum etiam hirtis pellibus sibi indumenta coaptant. Hi a saliendo, juxta linguam barbaram, etymologiam ducunt. Saltibus enim

utentes, arte quadam ligno incurvo, ad arcus similitudinem, feras assequuntur. Apud hos est animal, non satis absimile cervo, de cujus ego corio, ut fuerat pilis hispidum, vestem in modum tunicæ, genu tenus aptatam conspexi, sicut jam fati, ut relatum est, Scritobini utuntur. Quibus in locis circa æstivale solstitium, per aliquot dies, etiam noctu clarissima lux cernitur, diesque ibi multo majores, quam alibi habentur: sicut e contrario, circa brumale solstitium, quamvis diei lux adsit, sol tamen ibi non videtur, diesque minimi, quam usquam alibi, noctes quoque longiores existunt. Quia scilicet quanto magis a sole longius disceditur, tanto sol ipse terræ vicinior apparet, et umbræ longiores excrescunt. Denique in Italia, sicut et antiqui scripserunt, circa diem natalis Domini, novem pedes in umbra staturæ humanæ hora sexta metiuntur. Ego autem in Gallia Belgica, in loco qui Totonis villa dicitur, constitutus, status mei umbram metiens, decem et novem et semis pedes inveni. Sic quoque contrario modo, quanto propinquius meridiem versus ad solem acceditur, tantum semper umbræ breviores videntur; in tantum, ut solstitio æstivali respicente sole de medio cœli, in Ægypto et Hierosolymis, et in eorum vicinitate constitutis locis, nullæ videantur umbræ. In Arabia vero hoc ipso tempore sol supra medium cœli, ad partem aquilonis cernitur, umbræque versa vice contra meridiem videntur.

VI. Nec satis procul ab hoc de quo præmisimus litore, contra occidentalem partem, qua sine fine Oceanum pelagus patet, profundissima aquarum illa vorago est, quam usitato nomine maris umbilicum vocamus, quæ bis in die fluctus absorbere, et rursum evomere dicitur: sicut per universa illa litora, accedentibus et recedentibus fluctibus, celeritate nimia fieri comprobatur. Hujusmodi vorago sive vertigo, a poeta Virgilio Charybdis appellatur, quam ille in freto Siculo esse suo in carmine loquitur, hoc modo dicens:

> "Dextrum Scylla latus, lævum implacata Charybdis
> Obsidet, atque imo barathri ter gurgite vastos
> Sorbet in abruptum fluctus, rursusque sub auras
> Erigit alternos, et sidera verberat unda."

Ab hac sane de qua diximus vertigine, sæpe naves raptim cursimque adtrahi affirmantur, tanta celeritate, ut sagittarum per

aera lapsus imitari videantur, et nonnunquam in illo barathro horrendo nimis exitu pereunt. Sæpe cum jam jamque mergendæ sint, subitis undarum molibus retroactæ tanta rursus agilitate exinde elongantur, quanto prius adtractæ sunt. Affirmant esse et aliam hujusmodi voraginem, inter Britanniam insulam, Galliamque provinciam: cui etiam rei adstipulantur Sequanicæ Aquitaniæque litora, quæ bis in die tam subitis inundationibus opplentur, ut qui fortasse aliquantulum introrsus a litore repertus fuerit, evadere vix possit. Videas earum regionum flumina, fontem versus cursu velocissimo relabi, ac per multorum millium spatia, dulces fluminum lymphas in amaritudinem verti. Triginta ferme a Sequanico litore Euodia insula millibus distat, in qua, sicut ab illius incolis adseveratur, vergentium in eandem Charybdim aquarum garrulitas auditur. Audivi quendam nobilissimum Gallorum referentem, quod aliquantæ naves, prius tempestate convulsæ, postmodum ab hac eadem Charybdi voratæ sunt. Unus autem ex omnibus viris solummodo, qui in navibus illis fuerant, morientibus cæteris, dum adhuc fluctibus spirans supernataret, vi aquarum fluentium abductus, ad oram usque immanissimi illius barathri pervenit. Qui cum jam profundissimam, et sine fine patens chaos adspiceret, ipsoque pavore præmortuus, se illuc ruiturum exspectaret, subito quod sperare non poterat, saxo quodam superjectus insedit. Decursis siquidem jam omnibus, quæ sorbendæ erant, aquis, oræ illius fuerant margines denudati. Dumque ibi inter tot angustias anxius, vix ob metum palpitans resideret, dilatamque ad modicum mortem nihilominus opperiret, conspicit ecce subito quasi magnos aquarum montes de profundo resilire, navesque quæ absorptæ fuerant, primas emergere. Cumque una ex illis ei contigua fieret, ad eam se nisu quo potuit apprehendit: nec mora, celeri volatu prope litus advectus, metuendæ necis casus evasit, proprii postmodum periculi relator existens. Nostrum quoque, id est, Adriaticum mare, quod licet minus, similiter tamen Venetiarum Histriæque litora pervadit, credibile est parvos hujusmodi occultosque habere meatus, quibus et recedentes aquæ sorbeantur, et rursum invasuræ litora revomantur. His itaque prælibatis, ad cœptam narrandi seriem redeamus.

VII. Igitur egressi de Scandinavia Winili, cum Ibor et Ayone ducibus, in regionem quæ appellatur Scoringa venientes, per annos illic aliquot consederunt. Illo itaque tempore Ambri et Assi, Wandalorum duces, vicinas quasque provincias bello premebant. Hi jam multis elati victoriis, nuncios ad Winilos mittunt, ut aut tributa Wandalis persolverent, aut se ad belli certamina præpararent. Tunc Ibor et Ayo, adnitente matre Gambara, deliberant melius esse armis libertatem tueri, quam tributorum eandem solutione fœdare, mandant per legatos Wandalis, pugnaturos se potius, quam servituros. Erant siquidem tunc Winili universi ætate juvenili florentes, sed numero exigui; quippe qui unius non nimiæ amplitudinis insulæ, tertia solummodo particula fuerint.

VIII. Refert hoc loco antiquitas ridiculam fabulam: quod accedentes Wandali ad Wodan, victoriam de Winilis postulaverint, illeque responderit, se illis victoriam daturum, quos primum oriente sole conspexisset; tunc accessisse Gambaram ad Fream, uxorem Wodan, et Winilis victoriam postulasse, Freamque consilium dedisse, ut Winilorum mulieres solutos crines erga faciem ad barbæ similitudinem componerent, maneque primo cum viris adessent, seseque a Wodan videndas pariter e regione, qua ille per fenestram, orientem versus, erat solitus adspicere, collocarent: atque ita factum fuisse. Quas cum Wodan conspiceret oriente sole, dixisse: *Qui sunt isti Longobardi?* Tunc Fream subjunxisse, ut quibus nomen tribuerat, victoriam condonaret: sicque Winilis Wodan victoriam concessisse. Hæc risu digna sunt, et pro nihilo habenda. Victoria enim non potestati est adtributa hominum, sed e cœlo potius ministratur.

IX. Certum tamen est Longobardos, ab intactæ ferro barbæ longitudine, cum primitus Winili dicti fuerint, ita postmodum appellatos. Nam juxta illorum linguam, *Lang longam*, *Bart barbam* significat. Wodan sane, quem adjecta litera Gwodan dixerunt, ipse est, qui apud Romanos Mercurius dicitur, et ab universis Germaniæ gentibus ut deus adoratur; qui non circa hæc tempora, sed longe anterius, nec in Germania, sed in Græcia fuisse perhibetur.

X. Winili igitur, qui et Longobardi, commisso cum Wandalis prœlio, acriter, utpote pro libertatis gloria decertantes,

victoriam capiunt; qui magnam postmodum famis penuriam in eadem Scoringa provincia perpessi, valde animo consternati sunt.

XI. De qua egredientes, dum in Mauringam transire disponerent, Assipitti eorum iter impediunt, denegantes eis omnimodis per suos terminos transitum. Porro Longobardi, cum magnas hostium copias cernerent, neque cum eis, ob paucitatem exercitus, congredi auderent, dumque quid agere deberent, decernerent, tandem necessitas consilium reperit. Simulant se in castris suis habere cynocephalos, id est, canini capitis homines: divulgant apud hostes hos pertinaciter bella gerere, humanum sanguinem bibere, et si hostem assequi non possint, proprium potare cruorem. Utque huic assertioni fidem facerent, ampliant tentoria, plurimosque in castris ignes accendunt. His hostes auditis, visisque creduli effecti, bellum quod minabantur, jam tentare non audent.

XII. Habebant tamen apud se virum fortissimum, de cujus fidebant viribus, posse se proculdubio obtinere quod vellent, hunc solum præ omnibus pugnaturum objiciunt. Mandantque Longobardis, ut unum quem vellent suorum mitterent, qui cum eo ad singulare certamen exiret, ea videlicet conditione, ut si suus bellator victoriam caperet, Longobardi itinere quo venerant abirent: sin vere superaretur ab altero, tunc se Longobardis transitum per fines proprios non vetituros. Cumque Longobardi, quem e suis potius adversus virum bellicosissimum mitterent, ambigerent, quidam ex servili conditione sponte se obtulit, promittit se provocanti hosti congressurum; ea ratione, ut si de hoste victoriam caperet, a se suaque progenie servitutis nævum auferrent. Quid plura? gratanter quæ postulaverat esse facturos pollicentur. Aggressus hostem expugnavit et vicit; Longobardis transeundi facultatem, sibi suisque, ut optaverat, jura libertatis indeptus est.

XIII. Igitur Longobardi tandem in Mauringam pervenientes, ut bellatorum possint ampliare numerum, plures a servili jugo ereptos, ad libertatis statum perducunt; utque rata eorum haberi posset libertas, sanciunt more solito per sagittam, immurmurantes nihilominus, ob rei firmitatem, quædam patria verba. Egressi itaque Longobardi de Mauringa, applicuerunt in Golanda, ubi aliquanto tempore commorati dicuntur. Post hæc Anthaib et Banthaib, pari modo et

Wurgondaib, per annos aliquot possedisse: quæ nos arbitrari possumus esse vocabula pagorum, seu quorumcunque locorum.

XIV. Mortuis interea Ibor et Ayone ducibus, qui Longobardos a Scandinavia eduxerant, et usque ad hæc tempora rexerant, nolentes jam ultra Longobardi esse sub ducibus, regem sibi ad cæterarum instar gentium statuerunt. Regnavit igitur super eos primus Agelmundus, filius Ayonis, ex prosapia ducens originem Guningorum, quæ apud eos generosior habebatur. Hic, sicut a majoribus traditur, tribus et triginta annis Longobardorum tenuit regnum.

XV. His temporibus quædam meretrix uno partu septem puerulos enixa, beluis omnibus mater crudelior, in piscinam projecit necandos. Hoc si cui impossibile videtur, relegat historias veterum, et inveniet non solum septem infantulos, sed etiam novem unam mulierem simul peperisse. Et hoc certum est maxime apud Ægyptios fieri. Contigit itaque ut rex Agelmundus, dum iter carperet, ad eandem piscinam deveniret. Qui cum equo retento miserandos infantulos miraretur, hastaque quam manu gerebat, huc illucque eos inverteret, unus ex illis manu injecta hastam regiam comprehendit. Rex misericordia motus, factumque altius admiratus, eum magnum futurum pronuntiat: moxque eum e piscina levari præcipit, atque nutrici traditum, omni cum studio mandat alendum. Et quia eum de piscina, quæ eorum lingua *Lama* dicitur, abstulit, Lamissio eidem nomen imposuit. Qui cum adolevisset, adeo strenuus juvenis effectus est, ut et bellicossimus extiterit, et post Agelmundi funus, regni gubernacula rexerit. Ferunt hunc, dum Longobardi cum rege suo iter agentes ad quendam fluvium pervenissent, et ab Amazonibus essent prohibiti ultra permeare, cum earum fortissima in fluvio natatu pugnasse, eamque peremisse, sibique laudis gloriam, Longobardis quoque transitum paravisse: hoc siquidem inter utrasque acies prius constitisse, quatenus si Amazona eadem Lamissionem superaret, Longobardi a flumine recederent; sin vero a Lamissione, ut et factum est, ipsa vinceretur, Longobardis eadem permeandi fluenta copia præberetur. Constat sane quia hujus assertionis series minus veritati subnixa est. Omnibus etenim, quibus veteres historiæ notæ sunt, patet, gentem Amazonum longe antea, quam hæc fieri potuerunt,

esse deletam; nisi forte quia loca eadem, ubi hæc gesta feruntur, non satis historiographis nota fuerunt, et vix ab aliquo eorum vulgata sunt, fieri potuerit, ut usque ad id tempus hujuscemodi inibi mulierum genus haberetur. Nam et ego referri a quibusdam audivi, usque hodie in intimis Germaniæ finibus gentem harum existere feminarum.

XVI. Igitur transmeato Longobardi, de quo dixeramus, flumine, cum ad ulteriores terras pervenissent, illic per tempus aliquod commorabantur. Interea cum nihil adversi suspicarentur, et essent quieti, longa nimis securitas, quæ semper detrimentorum mater est, eis non modicam perniciem peperit. Noctu denique cum negligentia resoluti quiescerent cuncti, subito super eos Bulgares irruentes, plures ex iis sauciant, multos prosternunt, et in tantum per eorum castra debacchati sunt, ut ipsum Agelmundum regem interficerent, ejusque unicam filiam sorte captivitatis auferrent.

XVII. Resumptis tamen post hæc incommoda Longobardi viribus, Lamissionem, de quo superius dixeramus, sibi regem constituerunt. Qui ut erat juvenili ætate fervidus, et ad belli certamina satis promptus, non aliud nisi Agelmundi necem ulcisci cupiens, in Bulgares arma convertit. Primoque prœlio mox commisso, Longobardi hostibus terga dantes ad castra refugiunt. Tunc rex Lamissio ista conspiciens, elevata altius voce omni exercitui clamare cœpit, ut opprobriorum quæ pertulerant, reminiscerentur, revocarentque ante oculos dedecus, quomodo eorum regem hostes jugulaverint, quam miserabiliter ejus natam, quam sibi reginam optaverant, captivam abduxerent. Postremo hortatur, ut se suosque armis defenderent, melius esse dicens in bello animam ponere, quam ut vilia mancipia hostium ludibriis subjacere. Hæc et hujuscemodi vociferans cum diceret, et nunc minis, nunc promissionibus, ad toleranda eorum animos belli certamina roboraret: si quem etiam servilis conditionis pugnantem vidisset, libertate eum simul cum præmiis donaret. Tandem hortatu exemploque principis, qui primus ad bellum prosilierat, accensi, super hostes irruunt, pugnant atrociter, et magna adversarios clade prosternunt, tandemque de victoribus victoriam capientes, tam regis funus, quam proprias injurias ulciscuntur. Tunc magna de hostium exuviis præda potiti, ex illo

jam tempore, ad expetendos belli labores, audaces effecti sunt.

XVIII. Defuncto post hæc Lamissione, qui secundus regnaverat, tertius ad regni gubernacula Lethu ascendit. Qui cum quadraginta ferme annos regnasset, Hildehoc filium, qui quartus fuit in numero, regni successorem reliquit. Hoc quoque defuncto quintus Gudehoc regnum suscepit.

After this, the narrative becomes properly historical, and gives us the history of the Lombards from the time of Odoacer, to that of Charlemagne.

§ VII. THE TRAVELLER'S SONG.

In the Anglo-Saxon MS., known as the *Codex Exoniensis*, is the following poem.

It is known as *Wídsíð*, from the name of the narrator with which it begins.

It is better known as *The Traveller's Song*.

A claim to an antiquity, as high as the sixth century, has been made out for it. It is doubtful, however, whether this antiquity is valid in the eyes of any one but its commentators.

One undoubted element of value, however, it possesses. It gives *German names in German forms*.

The text is Mr. Kemble's; to whose Beowulf it is appended.

It is also to be found in Mr. Thorpe's edition of the Codex Exoniensis.*

Wíd-síð maðolade,
Word-hord on-leác,
Se ðe mæst
Mærða ofer eorðan,
Folca geond ferde.
Oft he flette ge-þáh,
Myne-lícne máþþum.
Hine from Myrgingum
Æþele on-wócon.
He mid Ealh-hilde,
Fælre freoþu-webban,
Forman síþe,
Hreð-cyninges
Hám ge-sóhte,
Eástan of Ongle;
Eorman-ríces
Wráþes wǽr-logan.
On-gon þá worn sprecan.
" Fela ic monna ge-frægn,
Mægþum wealdan.

* For the translation see Appendix.

Sccal þeóda ge-hwylc
Þeáwum lifgan,
Eorl æfter óþrum
Eðle rǽdan,
Se þe his þeóden-stól
Ge-þeón wile.
Þára wæs Wala
Hwíle sélast;
And Alexandreas
Ealra rícost,
Monna cynnes;
And he mǽst ge-þáh,
Þára þe ic ofer foldan
Ge-frægen hæbbe.
Ætla weóld Hunum,
Eorman-ríc Gotum,
Becca Baningum,
Burgendum Gifica,
Cǽsare weóld Creacum,
And Cælic Finnum,
Hagena Holm-rycum,
And Henden Glommum,
Witta weóld Swǽfum,
Wada Hælsingum,
Meaca Myrgingum,
Mearc-healf Hundingum,
Þeódríc weóld Froncum,
Þyle Rondingum,
Breoca Brondingum,
Billing Wernum,
Os-wine weóld Eowum,
And Ytum Gef-wulf;
Fin Folc-walding,
Fresna cynne,
Síge-here lengest,
Sǽ-denum weóld.
Hnæf Hocingum,
Helm Wulfingum,
Wald Woingum,
Wod Þyringum,
Sǽ-ferð Sycgum,
Sweóm Ongend-þeów,
Sceaft-here *Ymbrum*,
Sceafa Long-beardum,
Hûn-hæt Werum,
And Holen Wrosnum.
Hring-weald wæs haten
Here-farena cyning.
Offa weóld Ongle,
Alewih Denum;
Se wǽs þára manna
Mód gast ealra.
Nó hwæþre he ofer Offan
Eorl-scype fremede;
Ac Offa ge-slóg,
Ærest monna,
Cniht-wesende,
Cyne-ríca mǽst.
Nǽnig efen eald him
Eorl-scipe máran,
On orette,
A'ne sweorde;
Merce ge-mǽrde,
Wið Myrgingum,
Bi Fífel-dore,
Heóldon forð siþþan
Engle and Swǽfe
Swá hit Offa ge-slóg.
Hróþ-wulf and Hróð-gar
Heóldon lengest,
Sibbe æt somne,
Suhtor-fædran:
Siþþan hý for-wrǽcon
Wi-cynga cynn,
And Ingeldes
Ord for-bigdan,
For-heówan æt Heorote,
Heaðo-beardna þrym.
Swá ic geond ferde fela,
Fremdra londa,
Geond ginne grund,
Godes and yfles,
Þær ic cunnade,
Cnósle bi-dǽled,
Freo-mægum feor
Folgade wíde.
For þon ic mæg singan,
And secgan spell.
Mǽnan fore mengo,
In meodu-healle,

Hú me cyne-gode,
Cystum dóhten.
Ic wæs mid Hunum
And mid Hréð-Gótum,
Mid Sweóm and mid Geátum,
And mid Súþ-Denum,
Mid Wenlum ic wæs, and mid Wærnum,
And mid Wi-cingum,
Mid Gef-þum ic wæs, and mid Winedum,
And mid Gef-flegum,
Mid Englum ic wæs, and mid Swæfum,
And mid Ænenum,
Mid Seaxum ic wæs, and mid Sycgúm,
And mid Sweord-werum ;
Mid Hronum ic wæs, and mid Deánum,
And mid Heaþo-Reamum,
Mid Þyringum ic wæs,
And mid Þrowendum,
And mid Burgendum ;
Þær ic beág ge-þáh.
Me þær Gúð-here for-geaf
Glæd-lícne máþþum,
Songes to léane :
Næs ꝥ sæne cyning.
Mid Froncum ic wæs, and mid Frysum,
And mid Frumtingum,
Mid Rugum ic wæs, and mid Glommum,
And mid Rum-Walum ;
Swylce ic wæs on Eatule,
Mid Ælfwine,
Se hæfde mon-cynnes
Míne ge-frǽge,
Leohteste hond
Lófes to wyrcenne.
Heortan un-hneáweste,
Hringa ge-dáles,
Beorhtra beága,
Bearn Ead-wines ;
Mid Sercingum ic wæs,
And mid Seringum,
Mid Creacum ic wæs, and mid Finnum,
And mid Cásere,
Se þe win-burga
Ge-weald ahte.
Wiolane and Wilna,
And Wala-ríces,
Mid Scottum ic wæs, and mid Peóhtum,
And mid Scride-Finnum,
Mid Lid-wicingum ic wæs, and mid Leonum,
And mid Long-beardum,
Mid Hǽðnum and mid Hæleþum,
And mid Hundingum.
Mid Israhelum ic wæs,
And mid Exsyringum,
Mid Ebreum, and mid Indeum,
And mid Ægyptum,
Mid Moidum ic wæs, and mid Persum.
And mid Myrgingum,
And Mofdingum
And ongend Myrgingum,
And mid Amoþingum,
Mid East-þyringum ic wæs, and mid Eolum,
And mid Istum,
And Idumingum ;
And ic wæs mid Eorman-ríce ;
Ealle þrage
Þær me Gotena cyning,
Góde dóhte,
Se me beág for-geaf ;
Burg-warena fruma.
On þam siex hund wæs,
Smǽtes goldes,
Ge-scyred sceatta,
Scilling ríme ;
Þone ic Eádgilse
On æht sealde,
Mínum hleó-drihtne,
Þá ic to hám bi-cwom,

Leófum to leáne,
Þæs þe he me lond for-geaf,
Mínes fæder éþel,
Freá Myrginga ;
And me þá Ealh-hild
O'þerne for-geaf.
Dryht-cwen dúguþe,
Dohtor Eád-wines.
Hyre lóf lengde,
Geond londa fela,
Þoñ ic be songe
Secgan sceolde,
Hwær ic, under swegl,
Sélast wisse,
Gold-hrodene cwen,
Giefe bryttian ;
Ðoñ wit Scilling
Scíran reorde,
For uncrum síge-dryhtne,
Song á-hofan,
Hlúde bi hearpan ;
Hleóþor swinsade.
Þoñ monige men,
Módum wlonce,
Wordum sprecan,
Þa þe wel cúþan
ꝥ he næfre song
Sellan ne hýrdon ;
Ðonan ic ealne geond hwearf
E'þel Gotena.
Sóhte ic â síþa
Þa sélestan,
Þæt wæs inn-weorud
Earman-ríces.
Héðcan sóhte ic and Beádecan,
And Herelingas ;
Emercan sóhte ic and Fridlan,
Ond East-Gotan.
Fródne and gódne,
Fæder Un-wænes.
Seccan sóhte ic and Beccan,
Seafolan, and Þeód-ríc,
Heaþo-ríc, and Sifecan,
Hliþe, and Incgen-þeów,
Eád-wine sóhte ic, and Elsan,
Ægel-mund, and Hungar,
And þa wloncan ge-dryht,
Wið Myrginga.
Wulf-here sóhte ic and Wyrm-here ;
Ful oft þær wig ne á-læg
Þonne Hræda here,
Heardum sweordum,
Ymb Wistla-wudu,
Wérgan sceoldon.
Ealdne éþel-stól
Ætlan leódum.
Ræd-here sóhte ic and Rond-here,
Rum-stán and Gísl-here,
Wiþer-gield, and Freoþe-ríc,
Wudgan, and Haman.
Ne wæron ꝥ ge-síþa,
Þa sæmestan,
Þeah þe ic hý â-nihst,
Nemnan sceolde.
Ful oft of þam heápe
Hwínende fleág,
Giellende gár,
On grome þeóde,
Wræccan þær weoldan,
Wundnan golde,
Werum and wífum ;
Wudga and Hama.
Swá ic ꝥ symle on-fond
On þære feringe,
Þæt se biþ leófast,
Lond-búendum,
Se þe him gód syleð,
Gumena ríce
Tó ge-healdenne
Þenden he her leofað.
Swá scríþende,
Ge-sceapum hweorfað
Gleó-men gumena,
Geond grunda fela,
Þearfe secgað.
Þonc-word sprecað.
Simle súð oþþe norð
Sumne ge-métað,
Gydda gleáwne,

Geofum un-hneáwne,
Se þe fore dúguþe wile,
Dôm â ræran
Eorl scipe æfnán,
Oþþæt eal scacéð,
Leóht and lîf somód.
Lóf se ge-wyrceð,
Hafáð under heofonum
Heáh-fæstne dôm.

The three texts of Jornandes, Paulus Diaconus, and the Traveller's Song, give us the rough materials for the criticism of the traditions of the Gothic nation. Their historical and ethnological value is another question.

To begin with Jornandes. He quotes more than one earlier than himself, *e.g.*, Dio, Dexippus, and Ablavius. For *contemporary* events, any statement of any such writer is valuable.

But what is the value of such earlier writers, in respect to the times anterior to their own? in respect to the archæology, ethnology, or *origines* of the Gothic nations?

Many put this high; since the Germania of Tacitus espepecially mentions the existence of *carmina antiqua*, and access to the *carmina antiqua* is what may fairly be allowed to Ablavius at least.

The following facts, however, subtract from their value:—

a. Adaptations to the traditions of other nations (real or supposed), known to Jornandes and Paulus Diaconus through their ecclesiastical and classical learning are heterogeneously intermixed with the proper Gothic narratives.

b. In the case of Jornandes, numerous real or supposed facts, relating to the *Getæ*, are confused with those relating to the *Gothi*.

These objections are of *special* application.. To which must be added those which apply to tradition in general; even in its most unexceptionable form. Upon these, however, the present is no place for enlarging. The only question, at present, under notice, is the extent to which the *migrations*, which we find in the two Latin writers (for the Traveller's Song has but little in this way), rest upon true and genuine tradition—true and genuine tradition being the transmission of the account of an actual event from one generation to another, by *un*written communication.

For this, it is absolutely necessary that the event trans-

mitted be a *real* one; otherwise, the tradition is only the tradition of an opinion, *i.e.*, no tradition at all.

A tradition, too, must be different from an *inference*. *All traditions that coincide with inferences are suspicious;* or (changing the expression), *all inferences which give us the same results as a tradition weaken its validity* (*i.e.*, that of the tradition).

This, perhaps, requires illustration.

In England there existed, at the time of Beda, three populations; one called *Angli*, one *Saxones*, and one sometimes *Jutæ*, but oftener *Vitæ*. In Hampshire, the *Saxones* and *Vitæ*, or *Jutæ*, came in contact.

Similarly, in the parts about the Lower Elbe and Eyder, there existed three similarly-named populations; one called *Angli*, one *Saxones*, and one sometimes *Vitæ*, but oftener *Jutæ*. In Sleswick the *Saxones* and *Jutæ*, or *Vitæ*, came in contact.

Now Beda writes that the *Jutæ* of England came from the *Jutæ* of *Jut*land; and his statement generally (perhaps universally) is supposed to rest on either history or tradition.

I believe it to rest on neither the one nor the other. I believe it to be an *inference*—an *inference* so logically correct, that I only wonder at the combination of chances which make it actually wrong.

Nevertheless, the truth was as follows. The people of the Isle of Wight were called *Vitæ*, even as the people of *Jut*land were.

And, the people of the Isle of Wight, thus called, lay in geographical contact with certain Saxons; those Saxons being in similar contact with certain Angles. All this was also the case with the *Jut*landers.

Such coincidences wanted accounting for. A migration did this; and a migration was *inferred*.

The extent to which the similarity of name between *Gothi* and *Getæ* might engender a similar *inference*, similarly resembling a tradition, weakens the historical likelihood of the truth of Jornandes' account.

Such are some of the reasons for considering his derivation of the Germans (or Goths) of the Danube from the shores of the Baltic, as highly exceptionable.

The analysis, then, of traditions is one element of the criticism necessary for the texts in question.

Another is a correct appreciation of the extent to which *political alliance coincides with ethnological affinity*. Few notions are more common than that of populations engaged in the same wars, against the same enemies, and playing similar parts in history, being, therefore, members of the same stock.

In *defensive* wars this is generally the case.

In *offensive* wars, the union of different stocks (Gallic and German, Germanic and Slavonic, Keltic and Iberian, &c.) is so frequent, that the fact of a single alliance, comprising two populations, is, in many cases, scarcely so much as *primâ facie* evidence of their common origin, descent, blood, or ethnological relationship.

When the *names* of the leaders of such confederations are known, the evidence improves; but even then it is not conclusive.

The practical bearings of this, appear in §§ *Vandals*, and *Longobardi*, and elsewhere.

For a further notice see *Epilegomena*, § *Quasi-Germanic Gauls*.

§ VIII. THE GOTHS, GOTHINI, GOTHONES, GOTHLANDERS, AND JUTES.

In and of itself, the history of the Goths, properly so-called, is comparatively simple. We find them called *Ostro*-Goths and *Visi*-Goths; each with its peculiar royal line—the Amalungs for the former, the Baltungs for the latter. Separate, too, from the other Germanic populations, the Proper Goths have their great national heroes; some truly historical, as Alaric, Ataulfus, Euric, Theodoric, and Totila; others, but half-historical or legendary, as the great Hermanric, whose power, undoubtedly, had a real existence to a certain extent, but many of whose actions are either fabulous or unsupported by evidence.

Above all, the Goths Proper have their special geographical area, the starting-point of their power being the Lower or the Middle Danube. No mention of their name can be

traced higher than the reign of Caracalla; and (a fact of primary importance) *they were then in the country of the Getæ.* So they were when Decius and Claudius fought against them; so they were when, pressed by the Huns, they besought Valens to allow them to pass the Danube; so they were when Hermanric's kingdom was consolidated, and so they were until they invaded Macedonia, Illyricum, Greece, Italy, Southern Gaul, France and Spain. Of all the Gothic families their migrations were the most considerable.

It was a long one that took them from Germany to the country of the Getæ. It was a longer one which carried them from the country of the Getæ to Spain.

Of all the Gothic tribes the Goths Proper have most merged their nationality in that of the countries which they invaded. In Greece, in Italy, in Southern Gaul, and in Spain, no Goths are to be found as a separate substantive people; and no known dialect definitely and unequivocally represents the old Mœso-Gothic. On the Lower Danube itself, the Goths of the Crimea, now no longer distinguished by their German tongue, and, consequently, no longer easily distinguishable from their neighbours, are their sole representatives — if such they can now be called. In Germany itself, the mother-country, from which even at the beginning of their history they were already separated, the Thuringian dialect is supposed to be the most Gothic; but this—a statement made by Michaelis—has yet to be definitely confirmed.

But the history of the Ostro-Goths and Visi-Goths, is no history of all the populations whose name was *G-t*, *G-th*, or some similar form. Hence arises the long series of questions as to whether each population, thus connected in name, were connected in other attributes also; *i.e.*, whether they were *really* Goths, or only populations with a nominal resemblance.

I. Is there any connection between the *Gothones* and *Gothini?* Three points connect them.

1. The similarity of names — *Gothini* as compared with *Gothones.*

2. The fact that they each differ from the Slavonians of

their neighbourhood—The Gothones are separated from the Lygii, the Gothini from the Sarmatæ.

3. Both were—according to the evidence—neither German nor Sarmatian; since the *Sarmatæ* treated the Gothini as *alienigenæ*, and the *Æstii* spoke what Tacitus calls *British*.

Do these three points of connection establish an ethnological affinity?

I will lay down what I conceive to be an hypothesis capable of solving all, or nearly all, the difficulties arising from what may be called the *pluri-presence* of the root *G-t*, *G-th*, in the two names under consideration.

This is as follows: the root, *G-th*, was, in the case of the Slavonic and Lithuanian populations, in the same predicament with the root *Gr-k*, in the case of the Hellenic and Italian.

With the Hellenes, *Γραῖκοι* was the name of a single population within what, in the eyes of a Roman, constituted the Hellenic area; and the name was, almost certainly, native.

With the Italians, it was the name, not only for that particular tribe, but for the collective *Hellenes* also.

Mutatis mutandis.—With the Lithuanians the *G-t* (*G-d*, *G-th*) was the name of a single population within what, in the eyes of a Slavonian, constituted the Lithuanic area, and the name was, almost certainly, native.

With the Slavonians it was the name not only of that particular tribe, but for the collective *Lithuanians* also.

Thus—the *Æstii* of Tacitus, the *Easte* of the Germans, were called *Gutt*ones (*Goth*ones) by the more northern Slavonians of their frontier; just as the *Γραῖκοι* of Epirus were called *Græci* by the Italians of the opposite coast.

And, the *Gothini* of Tacitus were called by a similar name by the more southern Slavonians of their frontier, just as the Athenian Hellenes and others were called *Græci* by the Roman, Campanian, and other Italians.

Such is the hypothesis. I prefer this to believing that the *Gothones* and *Gothini* were so much and so thoroughly one and the *same section* of the same *branch* as for them to have borne the same name from Gallicia to Courland; in other

words, I believe the name to be *native* in one of the two cases only; so that the *Goth-ini* were *G-t* only in the eyes of their Slavonic neighbours, just as a Peloponnesian was a *Greek* in the eyes of a Roman only; whereas the *Gothones* (*Guttones*, &c.) were *G-t* in the eyes of their Slavonic neighbours and themselves as well, even as the Γραῖκος of Epirus was doubly Greek; Greek when he spoke of himself, and Greek when he was spoken of by a Roman.

The reason for drawing this distinction is as follows:—

a. There is no evidence of the numerous Lithuanic populations ever having had a *collective* or *general* name of their own, however much they may have had one given them by their Slavonic neighbours; in both of these respects being exactly in the same case as the *Germans*.

b. For the *specific* name of a particular Lithuanian population (*i.e.*, for a name equivalent to *Chatti*, *Cherusci*, of similar divisions of the *Germani*), the term Gothones (Gothini, Guttones, &c.), if extended from Gallicia to Courland, is of improbable (I do not say impossible), extent. No single *section* of a population is likely to have had so large an area.

c. The difference between the name of the people (*Gothini*), and their language (*Gallica*), suggests the likelihood of the *native* of the *Gothini* having been some form of *Gal* (*Hal*, &c.). In England, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the generality of writers spoke of the *people* of Germany as *Germans;* but of the *language*, as *Dutch*, High *Dutch*, or Low *Dutch*, as the case might be. Hence, we heard of *translations from the High Dutch*, even though the people who spoke it were called Germans.

Now I consider that the same Slavonians who spoke of the people of Gallicia as *Gothini* (a presumed Slavonic form), were also those who spoke of their language as *Gallic* (a presumed native form); even as one and the same population (the English) spoke of the *Dutch* tongue and the *German* people.

And I also consider that those same Slavonians called the language of the Gothini *Gallic*, because *Gallic* was the *native* name of it; just as the fact of *Dutch* being the native name of the German, accounts for the terms High Dutch and Low Dutch.

In *denying* the name *G-t* to be native to the *Goth-ini*, I assume that there is no special evidence in favour of its being so; and such I believe to be the case.

In *affirming* the same name to be native to the *Goth-ones*, I am prepared with evidence.

Is the name which in Tacitus takes the form *Gothones* native or foreign? known to the tribes to which it applies, or as strange to them as the term *Welsh* is to Cambrian? This is not answered in the reasoning upon the word *Æstii*; since it by no means follows that because one out of two names given to a country is undoubtedly foreign, the other is necessarily indigenous. The fact of the term *Gothones* being indigenous is not a legitimate inference from the exotic character of the name *Æstii*. Just as the latter designation was German, the former may have been Slavonic; and the one may have been as unlike the real native name as the other.

Prætorius, a Pole, writing A.D. 1688, in his Orbis Gothicus, devotes two sections to the following questions:—

"An reliquiæ nominis Gothici in terris Europeæ Sarmatiæ reperiantur?

"Unde nominis *Guddæ* contemptus hodie in Prussia?"

From these we learn that the Samogitians, Russians, Lithuanians, Prussians, Zalavonians, Nadravians, Natravians, Sudovians, Mazovians, and the inhabitants of Ducal Prussia were called GUDDONS by the people about Koningsberg, and that this name was a *name of contempt*, accounted for by the extent to which the populations to which it applied, had retained their paganism against the efforts of the propagators of the Prussian Christianity. "Guddarum infidelium nomen existit, adeo ut *Gothus* sive *Guddus* idem iis qui paganus et ethnicus, hostisque Christianitatis audierit."*

That it was also Slavonic is shown by a line from an old Tshekh (Bohemian) poem.

Gotskyja krasnyja diewy na brezje sinemu morju.
Gott-ish fair maidens on bank of (the) blue sea.

In order to appreciate the full import of the previous state-

* Lib. i. cap. i.

ment, I must anticipate a part of my inquiry. Good writers have identified those *Guddons* with the *German* Goths. As, however, they by no means overlook the fact of the *Guddons* being Lithuanic, they must suppose that the name was retained from that of the earlier Goths subsequently replaced by Lithuanians. In which case, the newer inhabitants, instead of retaining the name which they brought with them from their own country, took that of the older population.

Now even in its most moderate form, this assumption is considerably opposed to the usual course of ethnological changes, or rather the usual course of ethnological changes is opposed to it. In the first place, there are two cases of the incorporated and amalgamated aborigines of a country taking the name of their conquerors to one of the converse process. Thus France takes its name from the German Franks, and England from the German English, instead of the Franks taking their name from the Gauls, or the Angles from the Britons. Still the converse takes place sometimes; and, as if for the sake of invalidating the very connexion in question, one of the best instances of it is supplied by the very district under consideration. As far as any change took place at all in respect to the conquerors of the parts about the Lower Vistula it was just the contrary to the particular instance assumed to be the general rule. The German Prussians of Prussia *did* take the name of the aboriginal *Prus*.

Now if the name *Prussian* were adopted by the conquerors, who were really Germans, from the conquered, how unlikely is it that the lower orders,—the rural population of the agricultural districts, pre-eminently tenacious of nationality, who were really Lithuanians, should adopt the name of any previous Germans. In this respect, then, the assumption that the term *Guddon* is proof of the *Guthones* being *German Goths* is faulty.

Again—that the term *Guddon* comes from *Gothon*—is generally admitted. Even, as it is, the preservation of it is remarkable. But it becomes doubly remarkable if we assume a total change of population to have taken place between the time of its first application and the present. As it is—the population being supposed to have remained

unaltered—we have only to account for its permanence. Assume, however, a change, and you have an additional complication; since you have to account for its transfer as well.

The present existence, then, of the term *Guddon* = *Gothon*—is an argument, as far as it goes, against any change of the original population; or, changing the expression, the supposed immigration of Lithuanians, and displacement of Germans, which has been shown to be improbable in itself, is rendered more so by the details that must be assumed if we suppose that the *Guddon* took their name from any *Guttones* who were German.

In order to make the *Gothini* as Lithuanic as the *Gothones*, we must suppose one of two things, either that the former were an outlying isolated section of the Lithuanic stock, or that the intervening areas between the Gothini and Gothones were Lithuanic. Are there any reasons against the latter view—reasons against assuming the continuity of a Lithuanic population from the Carpathians to the Baltic (and *vice versâ*), from the mere magnitude of the area? None. The Lygian, which was parallel with it, is, in the same direction (from south to north), fully or nearly as large.

From the present distribution of the Lithuanian dialects, there are several; but that these are not insuperable, is shown in the *Prolegomena*.

I do not, however, press the point, since the approach of the Gothini to the servile condition indicates the possibility of their having been an outlying colony of captives.

All that I urge is the reference of the two (Gothini and Gothones) to a common ethnological division (that division being the Lithuanic), and the hypothesis which accounts for the similarity of names.

I also urge the necessity of bringing the older Lithuanians as far south as the parts just north of Gallicia, even if we hesitate to continue them up to the very country of the Gothones.

For clear and definite history,—and we must remember that history for these parts begins but little before the twelfth century—brings a Lithuanian population as far in the direc-

tion of the *Gothini* as the head-waters and marshes of the Pripecz.

The south-western branch of the Lithuanic family was well-nigh destroyed in the latter half of the thirteenth century (A.D. 1264 to A.D. 1282); a branch containing the important nations of the *Pollexiani* and *Jazwingi*.

1. *The first*,—" Sunt autem *Pollexiani Getharum seu Prussorum genus*, gens atrocissima, omnium ferarum immanitate truculentior, propter vastissimas intercapedines, propter concretissimas nemorum densitates, propter bituminata inaccessibilia palustria."

2. *The second*,—" Est autem *Jaczwingorum* natio versus aquilonarem plagam, *Masoviæ, Russiæ et Lithuaniæ terris contermina*, sita, *cum Pruthenica et Lithuanica lingua habens magna ex parte similitudinem et intelligentiam*, populos habens immanes et bellicosos, et tam laudis quam memoriæ avidos." —Dlugoss. i. p. 770. "(Maslaus Mazovitarum princeps) Pruthenicis auxiliis subnixus — *Pruthenos*, ad quos confugerat, *Jacuingos*, Slonenses, ceterique Pruthenici tractus barbaros, resarciendum casum acceptum pluribus blandimentis et persuasionibus in bellum sollicitat."—Id. i. 223.

Such the evidence of their *existence*.

Of their *extinction*,—A.D. 1264:—Boleslaus, the Grand Duke of Lithuania, so reduced them that—" eo uno prœlio omnis fere gens omnisque natio Jaczwingorum adeo deleta et extincta est, ut ceteris et his quidem paucis et agrestibus aut valetudinariis in ditionem Boleslai concedentibus, aut Lithuanis se conjungentibus, *hactenus ne nomen quidem Jaczwingorum extet*."—Dlug. i. p. 771.

Again—" Omnisque natio Jaczwingorum eo bello (quoniam pedem referre nec unquam pugnam etiam iniquam detrectare voluit) deleta est, ut pauci agrestes superstites essent, extunc et in temporibus nostris Lithuanis conjuncti, *sicque nomen Jaczwingorum perrarum et paucis notum extet*."

In the following list of varieties, to which a name so eminently Sarmatian in sound as *Jaczwing* undergoes in different MSS. and authors, the last is remarkably like the form *Gothin-i*, since we must remember that the termination *-zitæ* is

an affix —*Jazwingi*, *Jatwjezi*, *Jatwejczi*, *Jentuisiones*, *Jentuosi*, *Jacintiones*, *Getwe-zitæ* (the country being called *Getuesca* and *Gotwezia*) *Getuin-zitæ*.

II. If the common Lithuanic character of the Gothini and Gothones be admitted, the *Goths* of the Swedish district of *Gothland* may be considered.

When two populations of the same name occupy the opposite sides of a sea of moderate breadth, it is reasonable to suppose they are branches of the same stock.

Such is the case with the Goths of Gothland and the Gothones of Courland.

This *primâ facie* view may, of course, be set aside by certain facts.

Certain facts *are* against it here. These are—

a. The present Norse character of the Swedes of Gothland.

b. The account of Jornandes.

But (to set against this) the antiquity of the Swedes of Gothland is doubtful, and—

The account of Jornandes is improbable.

My own belief is that the population from whom the Swedish province of *Goth*-land took the element *Goth*-, were no more the Norse ancestors of its present occupants, than the people from whom the county of *Dor*-set took the element *Dor*-, were Anglo-Saxon ; so that, just as the *Dor*- in *Dor*-set was a Celtic root (*Dur*-otriges) though *-set* was Saxon, so was the *Goth*- in *Goth*-land other than Norse though *-land* was Norse.

a. No Scandinavian *name* in any of the early writers—the chief of these being Jornandes—is more German than such Anglo-Saxon words as Kent-*ing*, or Dor-*sæt-an* ; names of which the second parts (*-ing*, and *-sætan*) are Anglo-Saxon, but the first part (Kent-, Dor-) Keltic, *Cant*-ii, *Dur*-otriges.

b. No *tradition* proves more than the derivation of the *Brit*-ons from *Brut*-, the grandson of Anchises; in other words, *mutatis mutandis*, Jornandes takes the place of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

c. No Germanic population is found with any form of the root *G-t*, as its name, until it become an inhabitant of some country so designated.

The reasons for the existence of a Lithuanic population in Scandinavia, lie chiefly in the facts which it will account for. But this requires us to be sure that there is no other alternative.

If the existence of a Germanic population will not account for the presence of the form *G-t* (with its varieties) in Scandinavia, what population will?

The only two that present themselves for consideration, are the Finn, and the Lithuanic.

The fact of the root in question being *known* to be Lithuanic, and not known to be Finnic, is *primâ facie* in favour of the former.

The Lithuanian is the only known family of which it can be said that *G-t*, as the name of one of its members, in the mouth of a German would be likeliest of all known names.

The only word that can be set up against it *Easte*=*Æstii*, that being the only *known* German name applied to a Lithuanian nation.

But as *Easte*=*eastern* it could apply to eastern localities only; not to any in Scandinavia.

This leaves *G-t* as the only known name applicable.

Reasons for its being the one actually applied, are,—

a. It was, besides being the native, the *Slavonic* name as well.

b. It was from the Slavonians that the Scandinavian Germans were likely to take the name of a population, between whom and themselves the Slavonians lay intermediate.

c. Lastly, to certain of the Lithuanians on the *south* of the Baltic, a compound of the root in question actually *was* applied — East from Poland is Reið-*gota*-land—"En austr frá Polena er Reið-*gota*-land." — Fragment from the Fornaldar Sögur. (Zeuss, p. 500).

The Lithuanians then, *south* of the Baltic, are called by the ancestors of the present Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians, *G-t*. Surely, the same name, applied by the same people on the *north* of the Baltic, is likely to have been applied to Lithuanians also.

III. What applies to the Goths of *Goth*-land, applies also

to the Jutes of *Jut*-land, one being a name in one dialect of the Old Norse, the other in another; just as, at present, *Gothenburg* begins with *G*- in the mouth of a Dane, but with *Y*- in that of a Swede—*G*ötenburg, *Y*ötenburg.

IV. Is there any connection between the Getæ of Mœsia and the Gothini, the Gothones, the Gothlanders, the Jutlanders, &c., all or any? In putting this question, we must remember that the country of the *Getæ* is the country of the *Goths* also.

The difficulty involved herein, has already been indicated.*

So has the explanation of the greatest Gothic scholar living.

The present writer, in admitting the difficulty, differs from Grimm, by admitting the *migration from Germany* also.

But he believes that that migration was not undertaken by Germans calling themselves *Goths*.

He finds no evidence that they called themselves so before they reached the country of the *Getæ*.

They *then* took the name, *and not before;* just as the *Kent*-ings of Anglo-Saxon England took a name from the Keltic county of *Kent*.

This, however, is only a preliminary consideration. The real question is whether, or not, the similarity of name between the *Get*- of the Lower Danube and the *G-th* of Gallicia and Prussia be accidental? or is it referable to ethnological connection?

In this case, the distance is sufficient to admit of the resemblance to be accidental; and I do not *press* the relationship. Still I believe in it.

The same Slavonians who, as frontagers, called the one *Guddon*, were the frontagers to the *Getæ* also.

In this case the connexion is *verbal*, *i.e.*, it is of the same sort which gives the same name to the *Welsh* of Britain, and the *Italians*, whom the Germans called *Welsh* also. The Germanic populations, which fill up the interval, agree in calling their *non*-Germanic neighbours by some form of the root *W-l*.

* *Prolegomena*, § XIV.

But, besides this negative character of being *non*-Slavonic (and therefore called *G-t*), the two populations in question may have been *really* connected.

A reason in favour of this (as far as it goes) is found in the fact of the Slavonians differing from the Germans in the following particulars:—

The Germans called all *non*-Germans by one name—*Wealh*.

The Slavonians varied the name with the different *non*-Slavonic populations with which they came in contact.

Thus—they call the Finns *Tshúd*, and the Germans *Niemcy*; and this is a reason for thinking that they called none *G-t*, but the Lithuanians.

Further reasoning on the subject occurs in *Epilegomena*, § *The relations of the Getæ to India*.

No objections lie against the *Getæ* and *Gothones* being equally Lithuanic, from the mere magnitude of the area. If Slavonians could extend from Servia to Poland, Lithuanians might from Bulgaria to Prussia.

The objections that arise from the present limited area of the Lithuanian tongue are but slight. The limits of that tongue have ever receded.

Lastly, it should be remembered, that whatever facts brought the Gothones nearer to the *Gothini*, brought them nearer to the *Getæ* also.

Such is the hypothesis; which, whether convincing or the contrary, is submitted to scholars with a claim to their careful consideration. It explains the forms *Goth*, *Geta*, *Goth*-land, *Jut*-land, *Goth*-inus, and *Gotho*, without assuming any *migration by land* at all; only *two by water* (one of which is down a navigable river, and the other across a sea of moderate breadth); any displacement so great as that which is known to have occurred over part of the same area within the historical period, and any power given to any term more general than that which connects the names *Welsh* as applied to a Cambro-Briton, and *Welsh* as applied to an Italian.

§ IX. THE VISIGOTHS.

The royal family of the *Visi*goths was that of the Balt*ungs;* their chief kings, Fridigern, Athanaric, Alaric, Ataulfus, Wallia, and Euric.

Their fields of action were the Lower Danube, Macedonia, Greece, Italy, Gaul, Spain; their chief confederations with—

a. The subjects of Radagaisus, sometimes called, like the Visigoths, Γότθοι; but not beyond the suspicion of being Slavonians, since Radagaisus is a Slavonic rather than a Gothic form.

b. Silingian Vandals (from whom the province of Andalusia takes its name) in the invasion of Spain.

c. Alans.—*Ibid.*

The evidence in favour of the current opinion, that the element *Vis-* means *west*, and that *Visi-Goth* = *Western Goth*, is not conclusive.

The chief fact in its favour, is the name *Ostro*-Goth, to which *Western Goth* seems a sort of correlative. Yet such correlation is by no means necessary.

a. In no manuscript of any author, has the name been found with a *-t*, *i.e.*, *Westro*-Goth. Yet the *t-* in *wes-t* is as essential as the *-t* in *eas-t*.

b. *Vesus*, as a simple name, occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris.

> "Burgundio, *Vesus*, Alites,
> Bisalta, Ostrogothus."

At the same time, it must be remembered that Jornandes translates the word as *Occidentales Gothi.*

§ X. THE OSTRO-GOTHS.

The royal family of the Ostro-Goths was that of the Amal-ungs; their chief heroes, or kings, Ermanric, Walamir, Widemir, Theodemir, Theodoric, Totila.

The empire of Hermanric seems to have been in northeastern Hungary.

Theodoric was born in the neighbourhood of Vienna.

The chief seat of the Ostro-Goth conquests was Italy. Some of them settled in portions of Asia Minor.

a. Jornandes names a king *Ostro-Gotha.*

b. With the exceptions of the Visigoth conquests in Gaul and Spain, the localities of the *Ostro*-Goths are fully as *west*-ward as those of the so-called *Western* Goths.

c. The combination *-str* in the river *Ister*, is identical with the combination *-str* in *Ostr* = *east.*

All this throws a shade over the usual interpretation of the prefix *Ostro-*. At the same time, nothing very serious depends on the etymology.

The most important question connected with the *Ostro*-Goths and *Visi*-Goths, is that of their original name.

If they were not called *Goth* till they reached the land of the *Getæ*, under what name did they leave Germany?

Under that of *Grut-ungs* and *Therv-ings:* these two designations being those which, to say the least, have the best claim to be considered the native names of the great Gothic conquerors of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.

In Mamertinus and Eutropius, we find the forms *Tervingi;* Ammianus's form is *Thervingi.* Trebellius Pollio (*in Claudio*) has the name *Virtingia;* which has, reasonably, been considered to be a transposition of *Trevingi*, or *Tervingi.* The similarity of the name *Thuring-* leaves as little doubt in the mind of the present writer, as to the *Thervings* of Dacia having been originally the *Thuringians* of *Thuringia*, as there is about the *Angles* of England having once been the *Angles* of northern Germany.

The evidence in favour of the *Grutungs* is less satisfactory.

a. The *termination* only is *known* to be German; the *root* is only *supposed* to be so.

b. More than one writer calls them Σκυθαί.

c. The following passage distinguishes them from the *Ostro-Goths*—

> *Ostrogothis* colitur mixtisque *Grutungis*
> Phryx ager.—Claudian.

But as even the undoubted Goths are called *Scythians* by Zozimus, the second objection, the strongest of the three, is but slight.

In favour of them, is—

a. The fact of the *termination -ung* being German.

b. Their proximity to the *Thervings*.

c. The few facts known of their history.—Claudian de Quart. Consulat. Honorii, x. 623—637, writes,—

> "Ausi Danubium quondam tranare *Grutungi*
> In lintres fregere nemus, ter mille ruebant
> Per fluvium plenæ cuneis immanibus alni.
> Dux Edotheus erat. Tantæ conamina classis
> Incipiens ætas et primus contudit annus.
> Submersæ sedère rates, fluitantia nunquam
> Largius Arctoos pavere cadavera pisces.
> Corporibus premitur Peuce, per quinque recurrens
> Ostia barbaricos vix egerit unda cruores.
> Confessusque parens Edothei regis opima
> Rettulit, exuviasque tibi: civile secundis
> Conficis auspiciis bellum; tibi debeat orbis
> Fata Grutungorum, debellatumque tyrannum.
> Ister sanguineos egit te consule montes."

This crossing of the Danube, coincides in time with that of the Goths; as do the quarrels which rose out of it.

If the doctrine, that the *Grutungs* were Goths, though highly probable, be not wholly unexceptionable, the special identification of the *Ostro*-Goths with them, is still less so.

That the *Thervings*, however, were the *Visigoths*, is shown by so good an authority, as Ammianus calling Athanaric, *Thervingorum judex* (xxxi. 3); this Athanaric being the famous Visi-goth.

§ XI. THE ALEMANNI.

The first mention of the name, *Alemanni*, occurs in the same reign with that of the *Goths*, *i.e.*, the reign of Caracalla.

The standard quotation respecting the derivation of the name from *al*=*all*, and *m-n*=*man*, so that the word (somewhat exceptionably) denotes *men of all sorts*, is from Agathias, who quotes Asinius Quadratus: —Οἱ δὲ Ἀλαμανοὶ, εἴγε χρὴ Ἀσιννίῳ Κουαδράτῳ ἕπεσθαι, ἀνδρὶ Ἰταλιώτῃ καὶ τὰ Γερμανικὰ ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἀναγραψαμένῳ, ξύγκλυδές εἰσιν

ἄνθρωποι καὶ μιγάδες, καὶ τοῦτο δύναται αὐτοῖς ἡ ἐπωνυμία.—Agath. Hist. i. 6.

Notwithstanding this, I think it is an open question, whether the name may not have been applied by the truer and more unequivocal Germans of Suabia and Franconia, to certain less definitely Germanic allies from Wurtemburg and Baden, —parts of the Decumates agri,—parts which might have supplied a Gallic, a Gallo-Roman, or even a Slavonic element to the confederacy; in which case, a name so *German* as to have given the present French and Italian name for *Germany*, may, originally, have applied to a population other than Germanic.

I know the apparently paradoxical elements in this view; but I also know that, in the way of etymology, it is quite as safe to translate *all* by *alii*, as by *omnes*: and I cannot help thinking that the *al-* in *Ale*-manni is the *al-* in *alir*-arto (*a foreigner*, or *man of another sort*), *eli*-benzo (*an alien*), and *ali*-land (*captivity in foreign land*)—Grimm, ii. 628—Rechtsalterth, p. 359. And still more satisfied am I that the *Al-*, in *Al*-emanni is the *al-* in *Al*-satia=*el*-sass=*ali*-satz=*foreign* settlement. In other words, the prefix in question is more probably the *al-* in *el*-se, than the *al-* in *all*.

Little, however, of importance turns on this.

The locality of the Alemanni was the parts about the Limes Romanus, a boundary which, in the time of Alexander Severus, Niebuhr thinks that they first broke through. Hence they were the Marchmen of the frontier, whoever those Marchmen were.

Other such Marchmen were the *Suevi*; unless, indeed, we consider the two names as synonyms. Zeuss admits that, between the Suevi of Suabia, and the Alemanni, no tangible difference can be found.

The area whence we bring these Alemanni, or Suevi of Suabia, must fulfil certain conditions.

It must not be too limited; since it is the area from which not only the agri Decumates were Germanized in the first instance, but from which, eventually and indirectly, Switzerland and Austria have been, partially, Bavaria, wholly, Germanized.

Neither must it be too large; inasmuch as room must be left for the equally important divisions of the Burgundians, during the later, and for the Goths of the Danube, the Thuringians, and the Chatti, in the earlier, period of their history.

Modern *Suabia* comes under this category; so that modern *Suabia* may be considered as the *nucleus* of the Alemanno-Suevic confederation.

That active emperor, Probus, coerced the Alemanni; he coerced them and something more. He recovered the whole country of Suabia, and is said to have re-established the *limes*.

But from the time of Probus downwards, the Alemanno-Suevic encroachments steadily progressed. Before A.D. 300, they had become the ancestors of the present Germans of Switzerland; and, by A.D. 400, those of the Alsatians and Bavarians.

Such was their time and scene. Strongly contrasted with the Goths, they advanced their frontier gradually and continuously; and the effect of this is, that one half of what at present constitutes the High-German division, is of Alemanno-Suevic origin.

In individual heroes this division is poor; none of its kings or generals having the prominence of an Alaric, a Theodoric, a Gundobald, or a Clovis.

Putting together what has been said about the names *Alemanni* and *Suevi*, it is just possible that, of the two chief members of this alliance, those whose name was German were Gauls (the *Alemanni*), and those whose name was Gallic (*Suevi*) were Germans. This, however, is a forcible way of putting an apparent objection, rather than an objection itself.

If the Alemanni, originally, were not German, their nationality and characteristics must have merged into that of the Suevi early.

Believing the Vandal to have been Slavonic, the Alemanni (supposing *al-* to mean *alii*) would be in the same relation to the Suevi as the former were to the Goths.

It is not superfluous to remark, that the Alemanni and Alani are undoubtedly confused by more than one ancient writer,—a pregnant source of difficulty, which it is not necessary at present to enlarge on.

§ XII. THE BURGUNDIANS.

A document of A.D. 786, in noticing the high tract of lands between Ellwangen and Anspach, has the following expression,—in Waldo, qui vocatur *Virgunnia.*

Grimm looks for the derivation of this word in the Mœso-Gothic word *faírguni*, Old High German *fergunnd* = *woody hill-range.*

He also quotes the variations *Vergunt*, *Virgunda*, and *Virgunndia.*

I have little doubt but that this is the name of the tract of land from which the name *Burgundi* arose; and that it is the one which fixes their locality.

If so, between the Burgundian and Suevic Germans, the difference, such as it was, was probably, almost wholly political; both being High Germans of the water-system of the Maine and Neckar.

Nor is there much difference in the time and scene of the histories. Each encroached on the Roman frontier, but the Burgundians more exclusively in the direction of Gaul.

Mutatis mutandis, the latter were in Burgundy, what the former were in Alsatia, with this difference, that the Germans of the former area have now become Gallicized.

No section of the Germans exceeds the Burgundians, in the extent to which real or accredited acts of their historical great men, have developed themselves into legend; Gunther, Gundobald, and others, being the great centres of the Burgundian cycle.

1. Part of the Burgundian history is probably told under that of the name of *Franks*, since, it is not likely that, between the Germans who gave the name to Burgundy, and the Germans who gave the name to *Franche*-Comté, there was much ethnological difference, even if there were political ones; in other words, it is likely that some Burgundians were *Franks*. *All* were so in one sense.—See § XIV.

2. Part of the history which passes as Burgundian, can, on reasonable grounds, be deemed never to have been Burgundian at all; a fact which complicates the view of

the true Burgundians, in a manner the very reverse of the preceding remarks.

The Μαρούιγγοι of Ptolemy, on the Thuringian frontier, were Burgundian.

But these Μαρούιγγοι are *Merovingians*.

Hence, the Merovingians of *France* are Merovingians, not because they were the Merovingians of the conquerors of that empire, but because they were the Merovingians of Burgundy, or (perhaps, more specifically still, of) *Franche-Comté*.

§ XIII. THE BURGUNDIONES OF PLINY.

It is stated in the preceding chapter, that part of the history of another and different population may have been attributed to the Burgundians of Burgundy,

Pliny (H. N. iv. 14) writes, "Germanorum genera *quinque:* Vindili, quorum pars Burgundiones, Varini, Carini, Guttones. Alterum genus Ingævones, quorum pars Cimbri, Teutoni ac Chaucorum gentes. Proximi autem Rheno Istævones, quorum pars Cimbri mediterranei Hermiones, quorum Suevi, Hermunduri, Chatti, Cherusci. Quinta pars Peucini, Basternæ . . contermini Dacis."

This place, with Daci, Vindili, Varini, Carini, and Guttones, is somewhat strange for a people of Franconia. Its proper classification was, surely, with the Suevi, Hermunduri, Chatti, &c.

To this it may be added, that there are several isolated actions, such as a contest with the Goths, and another with Fastida, king of the Gepidæ, which give us *Burgundiones* too far down the Danube, to leave the history of the Burgundians of Burgundy so simple, as it was left in the chapter referred to. In other words, there must be either migration or another population called *Burgundian*.

The second alternative seems preferable; indeed the existence of such a second population is so certain, that the question is, not whether there were two Burgundies, but which of the two it was that Fastida (or the Goths) fought against, and which it was that Pliny meant by *Burgundiones*.

a. I think that these two were the same.

b. Also, that they were the Φρουγουνδίωνες of Ptolemy.

c. Also, the Οὐρουγούνδοι of Zosimus.

d. Also, the Βουρούγουνδοι of Agathias.

e. Possibly the *Bulgarians* of the later historians.

They were occupants of the parts east of the Upper Vistula, or between the Vistula and Bug. They were well-known to the Greek writers of the Byzantine empire; and the only question concerning them is, whether they were Scythians or Huns.—*Οὗτοι δὲ ἅπαντες κοινῇ μὲν Σκύθαι καὶ Οὖννοι ἐπωνομάζοντο· ἰδίᾳ δὲ κατὰ γένη, τὸ μέν τι αὐτῶν Κοτρίγουροι, τὸ δὲ Οὐτίγουροι, ἄλλοι δὲ Οὐλτίζουροι, καὶ ἄλλοι Βουρούγουνδοι. . . αὐτίκα γοῦν Οὐλτίζουροί τε καὶ Βουρούγουνδοι μέχρι μὲν Λέοντος τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ τότε Ῥωμαίων γνώριμοί τε ὑπῆρχον καὶ ἄλκιμοι εἶναι ἐδόκουν· ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ νῦν οὔτε ἴσμεν αὐτούς, οὔτε, οἶμαι, εἰσόμεθα, τυχὸν μὲν διαφθαρέντας, τυχὸν δὲ ὡς πορρωτάτω μεταναστάντας.*—Agathias, v. 11.

Still the similarity of the name is remarkable.

Considering, however, that their neighbours on the south were the *Goths* of the Danube, that the name is by no means *necessarily* native, that their country was the water-shed of the Vistula and Bug, and that *faírguni*=*hill* * in Gothic, it is by no means unlikely that, different as were the nations, these names may have been the same, *i.e.*, the German form for *Highlander*. Still it is quite as likely to be accidental; and, if the *Burugundi* of the Bug were *Bulgarians*, is so.

But the difficulty does not end here. Ptolemy has, *besides* his Φρουγουνδίωνες, a population called Βουγούνται.

a. The Αἰλουαίωνες (Helveconæ, see note in voc.) lay between the Ῥουτίκλειοι and the Βουγούνται.

b. The *Lygii Omani* came ὑπὸ τοὺς Βουγούντας.

c. The Βουγούνται came east of the Semnones, from the river Suebus (Σούηβος) to the Vistula.

These are very difficult conditions. At first it appears that we must separate the Βουγούνται from the Φρουγουνδίωνες, because Ptolemy mentions both; and that we must consider the former to be the *Burgundians* of Franconia, because Ptolemy does not mention these latter.

* See page lv.

We must do this, in order to avoid accusing a good writer of an omission on one side, and a repetition on the other.

Then, as to the locality,

a. The Ῥουτίκλειοι are on the Lower Vistula.

b. The *Lygii-Omani*, in the western part of Poland.

c. The *Semnones*, in Saxony. This leaves those parts of Lusatia and Silesia, which were not occupied by the Σιλίγγοι as the country of the Βουγούνται, too far to the north-west for the Φρουγουνδίωνες, and too far to the east for the Burgundians.

It is nearest, however, to the former; and hence it is the word Φρουγουνδίωνες, a term in *Slavonic* rather than *German* ethnology, of which the name Βουγούνται obscures the import.

At the same time, the complication which the two terms introduce in the otherwise clear and simple history of the true and undoubted Germanic Burgundians of Franconia and Burgundy, is by no means inconsiderable, neither does the present writer pretend to explain it.

All that he is inclined to do, is in the way of a negation. He is not prepared to connect the three by migrations and counter-migrations, simply and solely on the strength of the similarity of name.

§ XIV. THE FRANKS.

If *Frank*, =*free*, express an attribute, the name may appear as often as the attribute occurs.

That *Frank* was the name of a confederation rather than of a particular nation, is generally believed; all the members of it agreeing in calling themselves *free*.

Believing this, I believe that the view it involves may be extended; and that just as more nations than one formed a *Frank* confederacy, more confederacies than one may be included in the *Frank* name; and, if more confederacies, more sections and sub-sections of the Germanic stock.

Hence, instead of assuming migrations (many of them in the face of historical probabilities), to account for the Franks of *France*, the Franks of *Franche*-Comté, and the Franks of

Franconia, we may simply suppose them to be Franks of a different division of the Frank name.

All that follows from the proposed latitude given to the name *Marcomanni*, follows from the proposed latitude given to the name *Frank*.

Indeed, if we look at their geographical distribution, we shall find that the *Franks* were the *Marchmen* of the Roman frontier; and I submit to the reader the doctrine, that they called themselves *Franks* because they were so, *i.e.*, in opposition to their fellow-Germans, who were subject to Rome.

A German of the Decumates agri was not a Frank (though he might be an *Alemann*), because he was not really *free*.

The Burgundian of the interior country was not a *Frank*. Really *free* he was; but as his freedom was not contrasted with the dependence of his neighbours, it was not necessary for him to call himself so.

What is gained by the hypothesis? To say nothing about the minor migrations, it gets over (amongst others) the following great difficulty.

The Franks of Franconia are *High*; those of the Lower Rhine, *Low* Germans.

Such the hypothesis.

I. *The Franks of the southern frontier.*—Probus had to deal with both Alemanni and Franks. It is *probable* that these were the Franks of Franconia.

The Franks whom Aurelian chastised, were certainly so; and, upon the whole, I think it is these Franconian Franks (the Franks of the Upper Rhine) who appear earliest in history. Even if they do not, they appear far too soon to have the name accounted for by any conquests or migrations; movements either way, from the Upper to the Lower, or from the Lower to the Upper Rhine, involving equally great, though different difficulties.

The measure of the southern, or Franconian Frank conquest, is to be found in the name *Franche*-Comté; this being to them as Alsatia is to the Alemanno-Suevians, and Burgundy to the Burgundians.

The geographical relations of Franche-Comté and Bur-

gundy, along with the Frank character of the (geographically) Burgundian Merovingians, give the chief reason for believing that those tribes who were *politically* Franks of the Upper Rhine, were *geographically* and *ethnologically* Burgundians, at least for the middle portion of them. The southern members of this group were probably Suevian, the northern Hessian.

Again—the relations of the Burgundian Gunther to the Frank Sigfrid, in the traditions embodied in the Nibelungen Lied connect the two.

II. *The Franks of the northern frontier.*—The chief tribes who, ethnologically, formed this district were, as long as the early name (the name by which they were known to the Gauls) preponderated, *Sicambri*. In detail, they were *Gambrivii*, *Marsi*, *Gugerni*, and, probably, *Ubii*, *Usipii*, and *Tencteri*, *Bructeri*, &c.

When known as Germans, the collective name was out of place; since Tiberius, Drusus, and the other conquerors of the Lower Rhine, had not so much to deal with Germans as opposed to Gauls. as with Germans as opposed to each other. Hence came the less necessity for a collective name, and the greater necessity for a number of specific ones. The *Sicambri* of the *Gauls* are now the *Bructeri*, *Tubantes*, &c., of the *Germans*.

When the necessity for the distinction between the dependent Germans of the Roman territory, and the free Germans of the frontier (March) became necessary, the necessity of a general name came in again. This general name was *Frank*. The Franks of the Lower Rhine seem to have been chiefly Platt-Deutsch, though, partially, Old Saxon and Frisian as well.

The time of the actions of the Franks of the Lower Rhine, was a little later than that of those of the Upper; but it lasted longer. Its development consisted in the conquests of Clovis and Charlemagne. Its measure is to be found in the name *France*, and in the Saxon and Slavonian conquests.

In *France*, the Franks of the Lower Rhine, and the Franks of the Upper Rhine, met in the parts about *Franche*-Comté, and combined; the former swamping the latter, and making

it appear as if *Franche*-Comté and *France* took their name from the same Franks—such not being the case.

Again—the Franks of France appropriated the traditions of those of Burgundy, and, deducing themselves from Meroveus, became Merovingians; though that name is *Burgundian*.

The Franks of the Lower Rhine, like the Goths, much as they have conquered, have failed in continuing the existence of their Frank character. Those of France are Frenchmen; those of Low Germany, *read* in High German—their chief *spoken* language, the Platt-Deutsch dying out.

In Holland alone are they a separate substantive people—in Holland, *minus* Friesland.

It was the Low-German Franks who swept before them, and extinguished the Saxons—the continental ancestors of the English.

III. *The Franks of the middle frontier.*—These, as being difficult to separate on their southern and northern frontiers from those of Burgundy and Lower Rhine, have been taken last in order. They are the Hessian Franks (*Chattische Franken*) of Zeuss. Their history is less obscure than undistributed, *i.e.*, distinguished from that of the Franks above and below them.

Still there are the Franks, whose legends Sigfrid and the Nibelungen Lied represent, Franks more High than Low Germanic, as shown by the great extent to which *Burgundians* come in contact with the hero of that poem; which the Salian or Ripuarian Franks do not.

§ XV. THE SALII.

Franks, in respect to their independence, the Salii were, probably, intrusive Low Germans; their locality being the present *Sal*-land, near Deventer, and the banks of the Y-*sel*.

§ XVI. THE RIPUARII.

Ethnologically, the *Rip*-uarii were Franks of the *Ripæ* (the *banks* of the Rhine), &c.

Their name shows the possibility of a hybrid word; since *-uarii*=the *-wære* in *Cant-wære*, &c.; so that the *Rip-uarii* were really the *Rip-i-colæ*.

§ XVII. THE VARANGIANS.

This was the name of the Byzantian equivalent to the *soldiers of a free-company* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

These soldiers were almost wholly *Scandinavians*—to a great extent the Swedes of Russia.

The reasons against believing *Varangian* to be the same word as *Frank*, are—

1. The mention of *Franci* along with them, as a separate people.

2. The extent to which the *Varangians* were Scandinavians, rather than Germans of the Rhine.

In favour of it is—

The form of the present Oriental name for Europeans—*Feringi*.

This, in my mind, preponderates.

Connected by name only with the Franks, the truer ethnological affinities of the Varangians were with the Scandinavians of Russia.

§ XVIII. THE RUSSI, OR Ῥῶς.

I follow Zeuss in giving the Greek name (Ῥῶς) of this people; since the form *Russian* would convey a wrong idea.

No name is involved in more difficulties.

No history is more interesting.

The result of an attempt to construct a probable hypothesis out of the valuable facts given by Zeuss (ad v.), is as follows:—

In the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, the Dnieper, Volga, and Don, played the same part in determining a distant fluviatile migration with the Scandinavians, that the Danube is supposed to have done with the Thuringian and Bavarian Germans; or (*mutatis mutandis*) a series of migra-

tions in boats similar to that which took the Germans to Mœsia, took the Norsemen to the Black and Caspian Seas. Just, too, as the navigation of the Upper Danube implies the occupancy of some part of its banks, I imagine that those parts of Russia, where the systems of the Dnieper and Volga come in closest contact, were the seats of certain Norsemen; intrusive members of the Scandinavian division, who had penetrated from the Baltic to the head-waters of the rivers in question, at the expense of the original Lithuanians and Ugrians. The undoubted fluviatile character of this migration is an argument in favour of that of the Goths of Mœsia having been fluviatile also.

The evidence in support of this doctrine is as follows:—

1. The expedition which brought the Norsemen to Constantinople was *by water*:—*Κατ' ἐκεῖνον γὰρ τὸν καιρὸν τὸ μιαιφονώτατον τῶν Σκυθῶν ἔθνος, οἱ λεγόμενοι Ῥῶς, διὰ τοῦ Εὐξείνου πόντου προσκεχωρηκότες τῷ Στενῷ, καὶ πάντα μὲν χωρία, πάντα δὲ μοναστήρια διηρπακότες, ἔτι δὴ καὶ τῶν τοῦ Βυζαντίου περιοικίδων κατέδραμον νησίων, σκεύη μὲν πάντα ληϊζόμενοι καὶ χρήματα, ἀνθρώπους δὲ τοὺς ἁλόντας πάντας ἀποκτείνοντες. Πρὸς οἷς καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πατριάρχου (Ἰγνατίου) μοναστηρίων βαρβαρικῷ καταδραμόντες ὁρμήματι καὶ θυμῷ, πᾶσαν μὲν τὴν εὑρεθεῖσαν κτῆσιν ἀφείλοντο, εἴκοσι δὲ καὶ δύο τῶν γνησιωτέρων αὐτοῦ κεκρατηκότες οἰκετῶν, ἐφ' ἑνὶ τροχαντῆρι πλοίου τοὺς πάντας ἀξίναις κατεμέλισαν.*—Vita S. Ignatii.

2. It was *fluviatile*, *i.e.*, *viâ* a river rather than the ocean. The proof of this lies in a long quotation from the Arabian writer Ibn Fozlan, to be found in Zeuss (p. 550), describing their descent upon Georgia and Ajerbijan, by means of a fleet on the *Caspian*.

3. It was *Norse*:—"Misit etiam (Theophilus) cum eis quosdam, qui se, id est *gentem suam Rhos vocari dicebant*, quos rex illorum, Chacanus vocabulo, ad se amicitiæ, sicut asserebant, causa direxerat, petens per memoratam epistolam, quatenus benignitate imperatoris redeundi facultatem atque auxilium per imperium suum totum habere possent, quoniam itinera, per quæ ad illum Constantinopolim venerant, inter barbaras et nimiæ feritatis gentes immanissimas habuerant,

quibus eos, ne forte periculum inciderent, redire noluit. Quorum adventus causam imperator diligentius investigans, comperit *eos gentis esse Sueonum*, exploratores potius regni illius nostrique quam amicitiæ petitores ratus, penes se eousque retinendos judicavit, quod veraciter invenire posset, utrum fideliter eo necne pervenerint; idque Theophilo per memoratos legatos suos atque epistolam intimare non distulit, et quod eos illius amore libenter susceperit, ac si fideles invenirentur, et facultas absque illorum periculo in patriam remeandi daretur, cum auxilio remittendos; sin alias, una cum missis nostris ad ejus præsentiam dirigendos, ut quid de talibus fieri deberet, ipse decernendo efficeret."—Annal. Bertin. Pertz i. 434.

The only shade that has been thrown over this conclusion is the apparent use of the *Turk* word *Chacan* = *Khan*; but Zeuss well suggests that this is no Turk title, but the Norse proper name *Hakon*.

And, to confirm all this, Liutprand writes:—"Gens quædam est sub aquilonis parte constituta, quam a qualitate corporis Græci vocant *Russos*, nos vero a positione loci vocamus *Nordmannos*. Lingua quippe Teutonum *nord* aquilo, *man* autem mas seu vir dicitur, unde et Nordmannos aquilonares homines dicere possumus. Hujus denique gentis rex Inger vocabulo erat, qui collectis mille et eo amplius navibus Constantinopolim venit.—Compositis itaque secundum jussionem suam chelandriis, sapientissimos in eis viros collocat (Romanus Imperator), atque ut regi Ingero occurrant, denunciat. Profecti denique, cum in pelago eos impositos rex Inger aspicerit, exercitui suo præcepit, ut viros illos caperet et non occideret. Denique miserator et misericors Dominus, qui se colentes, se deprecantes, se adorantes non solum protegere, verum etiam victoria voluit honorare, ventis tunc placidum reddidit mare. Secus enim ob ignis emissionem Græcis erat incommodum. Igitur in Russorum medio positi ignem circumcirca projiciunt. Quod dum Russi conspiciunt, e navibus confestim sese in mare projiciunt eliguntque potius aquis submergi, quam igni cremari. Alii tunc loricis et galeis onerati, nunquam visuri ima pelagi petunt, nonnulli vero natantes inter ipsos maris fluctus uruntur, nullusque die illa evasit, qui fuga sese ad terram non liberavit. Russorum

etenim naves ob parvitatem sui ubi aquæ minimum est transeunt, quod Græcorum chelandria ob profunditatem sui facere nequeunt. Ingenti Inger confusione postmodum ad propria est reversus. Græci vero victoria potiti, vivos secum multos ducentes, Constantinopolim regressi sunt læti. Quos omnes Romanus in præsentia Hugonis nuncii, vitrici scilicet mei, decollari præcepit."—Liutprand, Hist. v. 6.

Lastly (and this also indicates the fluviatile character of the invasion as well), a remarkable passage in Constantinus Porphyrogenita not only distinguishes the *Russ* tongue from the *Slavonic*, but gives the names of the *different falls of the Dnieper in both languages.* Zeuss quotes Lehrberg, as having shown the *Russ* forms to be *Norse;* and without saying that the others are *not*, I admit that two of them are undoubtedly so; being compounds of the Norse word, *fors*=*force*, in provincial English,=*waterfall.*—Εἰς τὸν πέμπτον φραγμὸν τὸν ἐπονομαζόμενον Ῥωσιστὶ μὲν Βαρουφόρος, Σκλαβινιστὶ δὲ Βουλνηπράχ· διότι μεγάλην λίμνην ἀποτελεῖ.—Constant. de Adm. Imp. c. 9.

Again,

Εἰς τὸν ἕτερον φραγμὸν τὸν ἐπιλεγόμενον Ῥωσιστὶ μὲν Οὐλβορσὶ, Σκλαβινιστὶ δὲ Ὀστροβουνίπραχ· ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται τὸ νησίον τοῦ φραγμοῦ.—Ibid.

Vorenfors is, at the present moment, the name of the highest waterfall in Norway. *Holmfors*=*the water-fall of the island*, not the *island of the water-fall.*

The fact of a Swedish invasion of the Crimea, Thrace, Persia, and Georgia, and the inference of a consolidated Swedish occupancy of the watershed of the Volga and Dnieper, is clearer than the origin of the name.

In favour of its being Norse, are—

a. All the previous extracts.

b. A curious expression in Symeon Magister (A.D. 1140): —Οἱ Ῥῶς οἱ καὶ Δρομῖται λεγόμενοι. And again, Ῥῶς δὲ οἱ Δρομῖται φερώνυμοι, ἀπὸ Ῥῶς τινος σφοδροῦ διαδραμόντες ἀπηχήματα τῶν χρησαμένων ἐξ ὑποθήκης ἢ θεοκλυτίας τινὸς καὶ ὑπερεσχόντων αὐτοῦ. Δρομῖται δὲ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀξέως τρέχειν αὐτοῖς προσεγένετο. Ἐκ γένους δὲ τῶν Φράγγων καθίστανται.

Zeuss compares this with the Norse *rás*=δρόμος=*race* (the same word).

Against it are—

a. The utter absence of any such name applied to any portion of the Norsemen, in any of the numerous Norse writings.

b. Its present power, as the name of so large a country as Russia, with so few definite traces of Norse occupancy.

c. The name *Rhoxolani*, of a nation between the Don and Dnieper.

The following view is considered to reconcile these difficulties.

Previous to the descent on the Euxine and Caspian, the Norsemen conquered and occupied the country of the *Rhoxlanes*, and, after they had become known to their neighbours as *Rhôs*, harassed the eastern empire.

In being known to their neighbours by the name of the country they occupied, they were like the present Spaniards of Mexico.

The question as to the stock to which those *Rhox-lani* belonged, will bring with it a fact confirmatory of the previous view. Although we nowhere find that the Norsemen in question *themselves called themselves Ros*, the Finlanders at the present moment call them *Ruots*-alainen, and their country *Ruotsi*.

This is a fact which has long been known. It has also long been known that *-lainen* is the regular Finlandic termination for gentile nouns. Such being the case, the word Ῥωξολανοί has long been looked on as a genuine *Ugrian* gloss; and as Strabo mentions the *Rhoxolani*, there must have been, in his time, not only Ugrians in Russia, but Ugrians so near the Euxine as for words of their tongue to reach his informants.

Such I believe to have been the case. I think that there were Ugrians as far south as the Lower Danube. This confirms the notion that Russia was not originally Slavonic.* It also confirms the notion that there were Ugrians in South Europe before the Majiar invasion.

* See *Prolegomena*, § vi.

Strabo's notice of the *Rhoxolani* is as follows:—Ἡ δ' ὑπερκειμένη πᾶσα χώρα τοῦ λεχθέντος μεταξὺ Βορυσθένους καὶ Ἴστρου, πρώτη μέν ἐστιν ἡ τῶν Γετῶν ἐρημία· ἔπειτα οἱ Τυριγέται· μεθ' οὓς οἱ Ἰάζυγες Σαρμάται, καὶ οἱ Βασίλειοι λεγόμενοι, καὶ Οὖργοι, τὸ μὲν πλέον νομάδες, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ γεωργίας ἐπιμελούμενοι· τούτους φασὶ καὶ παρὰ τὸν Ἴστρον οἰκεῖν, ἐφ' ἑκάτερα πολλάκις. Ῥωξολανοὶ δ' ἀρκτικώτατοι τὰ μεταξὺ τοῦ Ταναΐδος καὶ τοῦ Βορυσθένους νεμόμενοι πεδία. Ἡ γὰρ προσάρκτιος πᾶσα ἀπὸ Γερμανίας μέχρι τῆς Κασπίας πεδιάς ἐστιν, ἣν ἴσμεν· ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν Ῥωξολανῶν εἴ τινες οἰκοῦσιν, οὐκ ἴσμεν.—Strabo, vii. p. 306.

From this it follows that modern *Russia* has taken its name, not—

a. From any dominant Norse conquerors, so-called; but—

b. From a portion of its area called *Ruotsi*, originally occupied by Ugrian *Ruotsolane*, but afterwards by Norsemen (chiefly Swedes), to whom the neighbouring nations extended the name of the territory.

In other words, the Northmen of *Ruotsi* were called *Rus*, even as an Angle of *Britannia* might be called *Britannus*.

§ XIX. THE CHATTUARII.

The Ῥῶς were connected with the *Varangi*, but, as the *Varangi* were connected with the Franks in name only, the two previous sections have been, to a certain extent, episodical.

I. True occupants of Frank localities, and probably true members of a Frank confederacy are the *Chattuarii*.

This is no Low German form of the word *Chas-uarii;* although, at the first view, it seems such; since the single *s* has a less tendency to become *t* than the double one; or (changing the expression), the High German *s* most usually becomes *t* in Low German when the vowel that precedes it is short. Now, the *a* in *Chas*-uarii is long; since it represents the *a* in name of the river *Hase*. Hence, *Chas*-uarii and *Chatt*-uarii are *not* in the same relation to each other as *Hesse* is to *Chatti*.

Like Tacitus, Dion makes no mention of the Chattu-arii.

Strabo does; his form being Χαττουάριοι.

So does Velleius Paterculus; his form being *Attu*-arii.

Ptolemy's Χαιτούωροι introduce a complication which will be noticed in the sequel.

The locality of the Chatt-uarii of Strabo and Paterculus was the watershed of the Ruhr and Lippe. Strabo mentions them in conjunction with the Gambrivii, and Paterculus with the Bructeri—"Intrata protinus Germania, subacti Caninefates, *Attuarii*, Bructeri, recepti Cherusci."—ii. 105.

They increase in historical prominence as we advance; and in the reign of Julian, Ammianus writes "Rheno exinde transmisso regionem subito pervasit Francorum quos *Attuarios* vocant." — xx. 10.

Between the eighth and eleventh centuries the name is common, and numerous documents speak of the *terra*, *pagus* and *comitatus* of the *Chatuarii*, *Hattuarii*, *Hazzoarii*,* *Attuarii*, *Hattera*,† and *Hettera*, and numerous places are mentioned as lying within it.

All these lay on the western side of the Rhine, *i.e.*, on the Niers, a feeder of the Maas; so that the minute ethnologist may divide the *Attuarii* of the middle-age writers into the eastern and western branches.

"In A.D. 715 *Saxones* vastaverunt terram *Chatuariorum*." —Annal. S. Amand. Pertz. i. 6.

But the most interesting fact connected with the Chatt-*uarii* is the occurrence of their native name *Hæt*-ware in the Traveller's Song, and Beowulf.

The king, whose son, the hero of the great Angle epic, Beowulf, succeeded, bore a name the form of which was—

In A.S., *Higelac*—

In Icelandic, *Hugleikr*—

In Latin, *Chochilaichus*;

being, variously called, a Dane, a Geat, and an Angle.

His descent upon one of the *pagi* of King Theodoric is thus mentioned by Gregory of Tours:—"His ita gestis Dani cum rege suo, nomine Chochilaicho, evectu navali per mare

* A near approach to the form *Chasuarii*.

† Compare this with *Bructeri*, as opposed to *Boructuarii*.

Gallias appetunt, egressique ad terras *pagum* unum de regno Theodorici devastant atque captivant, oneratisque navibus tam de captivis quam de reliquis spoliis reverti ad patriam cupiunt. Sed rex eorum in litus residebat, donec naves altum mare comprenderent, ipse deinceps secuturus; quod cum Theodorico nuntiatum fuisset, quod scilicet regio ejus fuerit devastata, Theodebertum, filium suum, in illas partes cum valido exercitu ac magno armorum apparatu direxit. Qui, interfecto rege, hostes navali prœlio superatos opprimit, omnemque rapinam terræ restituit."—iii. 3.

Now from Beowulf we learn that the *pagus* of the Franks who killed *Higelac* was that of the *Hæt-wære*.

In a document of A.D. 769, we find—"Silva quæ vocatur *Heissi*, in aquilonari parte fluvii Ruræ."

Later still we find the form *Hese*, and, at the present moment, there is a town called *Heis*-ingen, on the right bank of the Ruhr, between *Essen* and Werden.*

These names, then, as well as that of the town of *Essen*, give us the area of those Germans who were called in Platt-Deutsch—

a. *Chatt*-uarii, or *Att*-uarii.

b. In High German *Hazz*-oarii.†

Whose name also was either compound or simple, *i.e.*, *Chattuarii* or *Chatti*, *Hazzoarii* or *Hesse;* this latter form being preserved in the present form, *Essen;* which is High German in respect to the *ss*, but Old Saxon in respect to the omission of the initial aspirate.

In Tacitus (Ann. i. 50, 51) we find a notice of the *Silva Cæsia*, the locality of the Marsi, and the seat of the worship of the *dea Tacfana*.

This looks like the name of the country about *Essen* in its oldest forms.

The connection between the Marsi, Gambrivii, and other populations belonging to the *Sicambrian* division, with the *Chattuarii*, is somewhat doubtful.

The name may have originated in the root *Cæs*- of the *silva Cæsia*, and so have been older than that of the popula-

* D. S. ii. 620.

† But not *Has*-uarii=*Chas*-uarii.

tion; a fact indicated by the termination *-wære* = *-uarii* = *-colæ* in Latin,—*Chatt-uarii* = Chess-*uarii* = *Cæsi-colæ*.

In this case, Chattuarii is the Low German form of a name of the *Marsi* and others, taken from the forest district they occupied,—just as numerous minor tribes might be called *Hercynic*, or *Bacenic*, from the *Hercynian* or *Bacenian* forests.

But it may also indicate a settlement of intrusive *Chatti* from *Hesse*, and the name be newer than the population.

I incline to the former of these views; still admitting the difficulty involved in the fact of populations with names so like as *Chatt*-uarii (= *Cæsi-colæ*), *Chas*-uarii (occupants of the Hase), and *Chatti* (occupants of Hesse) being so-called, independent of any special connection.

The hypothesis that the *silva Cæsia* was a *common* rather than a *proper* name, and, as such, one which might occur in more districts than one, would solve the difficulty. The solution, however, is, at best, but hypothetical. If valid, however, *Hesse* itself might be but a *silva Cæs-ia*, just as *Burgundy* was a *Virgunt*.

Hence, the Chattuarii were High Germans or Low Germans, according to the view we take of the origin of their name. Or they may have been *modified* High Germans—High Germans in origin, but Low Germans in locality, and several other characteristics.

We have seen that, although the word *Chatt-uarii* is not the Low German form for the *Chas*-uarii of the *Hase*, it is something of the kind. It is the Low German name of the Hazz-*oarii* of *Essen*, and the parts about that town.

If Low Germans, they were, probably, Platt-Deutsch rather than Saxon, and Frisian rather than Platt-Deutsch—the reasoning running thus:—

a. Their hostility to the Saxons is evidence, as far as it goes, for the two populations belonging to different divisions.

b. The occupants of the *Gau* Destarbenzon, within the Chattuarian area, were Frisians.—"*Frisiones* qui vocantur Destarbenzon."—Annal. Fuld. ad an. 885. Pertz i. 402.

II. The *Attuarii of the Doubs*.—In *Prolegomena*, § XII., it was stated that certain *Chamavi* and *Chatt-uarii* seem to have

been removed from the lower Rhine to Burgundy, as colonists, and to have settled on the Doubs.

From the end of the eighth century downwards, the notices of a *pagus*, and *comitatus Attuariorum* are numerous,—the locality being the valleys of the Vincenne, Tille, and Beze, and the neighbouring parts of the water-system of the Doubs.

The *pagus Commavorum* joined the pagus *Attuariorum* on the Doubs, even as the areas of the *Chamavi* and *Attuarii* were conterminous on the Lower Rhine. For the numerous references to these interesting settlements, see Zeuss, pp. 582—584. They deserve more attention from local antiquaries than they have found.

III. The Χαιτούωροι *of Ptolemy*.—This writer, who says nothing about any Chatt-uarii on the Lower Rhine, places a population with a name so like it as Χαιτ-ούωροι on the part between the *Upper* Rhine and Danube, amongst the Danduti, Turones, Merovingi, and other widely different sections of the Germanic population; and, to add to the confusion, he places Κασ-ουάροι not very far from Χαιτ-ούωροι.

Is this to be put down to erroneous information, and to pass as inaccuracy? Probably. At the same time an intrusion of *Chatti*, from the southern portion of their area may have taken place, and the name *Chassi*, or *Chasuarii* (*Hazzi* or *Hazz-oarii*) have thus originated. The Low German form in *-t-*, however, is against this view.

The fact of an inaccuracy is the likelier.

§ XX. THE SUEVI.

I. *The Suevi of Suabia*.—The name of the country called Suabia is a true ethnological term, even as *Franconia* is one. The one means the country occupied by the *Suevi*, the other the country occupied by the *Franks*. *Bavaria* is another such name, derived from the *Boii*. *Saxony* is in a similar, though somewhat different, predicament. They all, however, agree in being names of countries derived from their populations. *Hesse* is, probably, the same, and *Thuringia* also.

At what time the name first became an unequivocal geographical designation* of what now, in the way of politics, coincides with the Grand Duchy of Baden and part of Wurtemburg, and, in respect to its physical geography, is part of the Black Forest, is uncertain. It was not, however, later than the reign of Alexander Severus (ending A.D. 235)—the Tabula Peutingeriana being supposed to be referable to that date. Therein, ALAMANNIA and SUEVIA appear together—as terms for that part of Germany which had previously gone under the name of *Decumates agri*, and the parts about the *Limes Romanus*.

With this, then, begins the history of the *Suevi* of *Suabia*, or, rather, of the *Suabians*. Their alliances were chiefly with the Alamanni and Burgundians; their theatre the German side of France, Switzerland, Italy, and (in conjunction with the Visigoths) Spain. Their epoch is from the reign of Alexander to that of Augustulus, in round numbers, from about A.D. 225 to A.D. 475, a period of two hundred and fifty years.

Their *maximum* amount of historical prominence was the time when Ricimer the *Suevian*, and Gundobald the *Burgundian*, made and unmade such emperors as Severus and Olybrius, the immediate predecessors of Augustulus.

Now is the time to take a measure of the extent to which the notion † that *Suev- was no native German term at all, but a Keltic name adopted by the Romans*, is a paradox, or a probable inference from the early notices of the populations so-called.

1. It is not a question whether the root *Suev-* was Keltic or not. It is known to have been so.

2. Nor is there *much* doubt about its having been from the Gauls that the Romans took it: since it was probably Gauls from whom Cæsar learned the names of the allies and subjects of Ariovistus.

* Niebuhr mentions an inscription noticing a *Victoria Suevica* in the reign of Nerva. But there is no evidence of this having been a victory over the *Suevi* of *Suabia*. Cæsar's victory over the *Suevi* of Ariovistus was a *Victoria Suevica*, but no victory over the people of the *Decumates agri*.

† See *Prolegomena*, § xv.

The only doubt is about its being *exclusively* Keltic, *i.e.*, not German.

The reason in favour of this view are, perhaps, all referable to one head, *viz.*, the facts which the hypothesis will account for. Of these the chief are—

1. The *generality* of the term, as seen by the express evidence of Tacitus himself.

2. The equally express evidence of Tacitus to the fact of a general or common name for the Germans being *recent;* and of that name being *Germani*—not *Suevi.*

3. The difficulty of making it apply to any great *divisions* of the Germanic stock. For such, we have already, in the names *Ingævones*, *Istævones*, and *Herminones*, more than we can easily deal with.

4. The non-mention of the name *Chatti* in Cæsar, combined the high probability of some, at least, of Cæsar's *Suevi* having belonged to that branch.

5. The fact of Tacitus, who places the *Chatti* in Cæsar's locality of the Suevi, placing the Suevi to the east of it.

6. The difficulty of accounting for this by means of a migration. Though Cæsar has no mention of the Chatti, and Tacitus has, it is not Tacitus who *first* notices them. The name appears in Strabo. Hence, if there were a real bodily change of locality on the part of the Suevi, thus supposed to have been driven eastwards by the Chatti, the displacement must have occurred between the time of Cæsar and Strabo, *i.e.*, between the time of Julius and Augustus Cæsar—and that without either the Romans of Gaul or the Germans noticing it.

However, what a migration will *not* explain, the assumption of the word *Suevi* being a synonym to some of the previous names *will*. *Suevi* may mean *Chatti*. *Suevi* may mean *Hermunduri*, or it may (as I believe it does) *partially* coincide with *both*.

But what explains the *synonym?* Nothing better than the existence of a second language, especially when that second language is no fiction, but a reality.

What lies against this? I will put the only strong argument on this side of the question in its strongest form. From

the middle of the third century * to the present day, the root *Suab-*, or *Suev-*, has been a *native German* name for the *Germans of Suabia*. Before this, we hear of *Suevi*, but their locality is not *Suabia*.

What does this prove? That *Suev-* was a German name *previously?* By no means. It merely proves that a certain area was called by the Romans after a population named *Suevi*, and that certain Germans who settled there took their name from the area. Kent, at the present moment, is English, and the *Kent-ings* who occupied part of it during the Anglo-Saxon period were English. But does this make Kent an English word? No. It is British = *Cant*-ium, as is well-known.

Up to the time in question (*i.e.*, the reign of Alexander), the known facts are quite as much against *Suev-* being a German root as in favour of it. Cæsar's *Suevi* are described by *Gauls*, and Tacitus's are in a locality which at one and the same time is different from Cæsar's, and *Slavonic*. No one, who has realized the extent to which national names vary with the language of the informants, will say that the root *Suev-*, as applied to the subjects of Ariovistus, may not be as *exclusively* Gallic, as the word *Welsh* is *exclusively* Germanic.

Hence, up to the time in question, *Suevia* is simply the name of the country of a population that the Romans and Kelts called *Suevi*—a population which need not even be Germanic, still less, necessarily, call themselves by *Suev-*.

* This is allowing the term *Suevus*, as applied to certain populations and individuals (*e.g.*, Ricimer) by the Latin writers, an excessive extension. The same authors would have called Hengist, had such a personage been in Rome, a *Briton*. Yet he was no such thing. Such a Cheruscan, too, as the brother of Arminius, would also have been called *Germanus*. Yet such a name was strange to the individual himself. Similarly, Englishmen call Prince Albert a German, and (perhaps) in speaking English he calls himself so. Yet he is a *Deutsche*. These remarks are necessary, since the reader cannot too clearly see that the question is not whether certain *Suevi* were Germans, but whether such Germans called themselves *Suevi*. However, as the argument is put in its strongest form, the objection is not pressed: otherwise the truly unexceptionable evidence of *Suev-* being a German root, begins when the Germans of Suabia, unequivocally speaking of themselves, in their own language call themselves *Suaben*. This is much later.

It is when we can find an undoubtedly Germanic population in this country of *Suevia* calling themselves *Suevi*, that the reasons in favour of its native origin begin to preponderate; since the indigenous use of the name at one time is strong *primâ facie* evidence of its indigenous use at another.

Whether, however, it be strong enough to set against the series of facts with which the investigation commenced, combined with the easy explanation of them by the hypothesis that the word was originally other than German, is submitted to the consideration of the reader.

All the difficulties are reducible to a single fact, *viz.*, that the present undoubtedly German name *Suabia* has arisen out of a *Roman* rather than a *native* appellation—the *Roman* name itself having arisen out of a Keltic, the Keltic, perhaps, out of a Slavonic. Whoever makes a difficulty of this should remember that the word *Germany* itself is in the same predicament.

But this implies that the ancestors of the present *Suabians* became sufficiently Romanized to take for themselves a national name, which the Romans had originally taken from the Gauls —a strange name, in short. The following extracts suggest the answer to this:—

" Avitus, on his arrival in Rome, was acknowledged emperor; but Ricimer, a Suevian of royal descent, was now all-powerful in the city. All the barbarians, who acted a prominent part at Rome, must not be looked upon as savages; they were Christians, and spoke and understood the *lingua vulgaris*, which already resembled the Italian more than the Latin; they were just as civilised as our ancestors in the middle ages. A few of them had a shadow of classical education, as Theodoric, the Visigoth, and the younger Alaric: but the case was quite different with Ricimer and his equals, who no doubt heartily despised the culture of the Romans. Those Germans, unfortunately, were not one shade better than the effeminate Italians; they were just as faithless and cruel. * * * * Gundobald, king of the Burgundians, who had now become *patricius*, and succeeded Ricimer, proclaimed Glycerius emperor. But the court of Constantinople

sent against him Julius Nepos, likewise a noble Roman, who, with some assistance from Constantinople, took possession of Rome and Ravenna. Glycerius abdicated; but Orestes, a Roman of Noricium, who had risen into importance as early as the time of Attila, refused obedience to Nepos. After the withdrawal of Gundobald from Italy, Orestes became *patricius*, that is commander-in-chief."—Niebuhr, Lecture 138.

The countrymen, then, of Gundobald, at least, *were* Romanized; and that largely.

I have said that the undoubted use of the root *Suev-*,* as applied by certain Germans to themselves, is the only *strong* reason against the original *non*-Germanic character of the word. As others, however, may be satisfied with the following derivation, it is laid before them:—*Swabe*, Middle High German; *Suâpa*, Old High German; *Svæfas*, Anglo-Saxon, are derived from the root *swiban* = *sway*, *move unsteadily;* and, hence, *Suevi* (or *Suebi*) is the designation of a people of unsteady migratory habits—"*unstäten* (*schwebenden*) *Lebensweise*."—Zeuss, p. 56.

It cannot be denied that the passage of Strabo confirms this view:—*Κοινὸν δ' ἐστὶν ἅπασι τοῖς ταύτῃ τὸ περὶ τὰς μεταναστάσεις εὐμαρὲς, διὰ τὴν λιτότητα τοῦ βίου καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ γεωργεῖν, μηδὲ θησαυρίζειν, ἀλλ' ἐν καλυβίοις οἰκεῖν ἐφήμερον ἔχουσι παρασκευήν· τροφὴ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν θρεμμάτων ἡ πλείστη, καθάπου τοῖς Νομάσιν· ὥστ' ἐκείνους μιμούμενοι, τὰ οἰκεῖα ταῖς ἁρμαμάξαις ἐπάραντες, ὅποι ἂν δόξῃ, τρέπονται μετὰ τῶν βοσκημάτων.* Still, I think it unsatisfactory.

II. *The Suevi of Ptolemy.*—Ptolemy's *Suevi* (see text) are the *Σουήβοι Ἀγγεῖλοι*, to the east of the Lombards, and on the middle *Albis*,† and the *Σουήβοι Σεμνόνες* extending from the *Albis*, to the river *Suebus*.

This division introduces a difficulty which even a migration will not explain.

The Suevi of Suabia are High Germans.

The *Ἀγγεῖλοι Σουήβοι* can scarcely have been other than Angle, *i.e.*, Saxon.

* *Swæfas* occurs in the Traveller's Song.

† I write *Albis*, because the river of the *Semnones* I believe to have been not the *Elbe* but the *Saale*. See note in vv. *Ex Hermunduris Albis oritur.*

So that whether we assume a movement of the Angle Suevi from Suabia, or one of the Suabian Suevi from the Angle country, or deduce both from some intermediate area, we must assume a change of dialect as well. Zeuss does this; and deriving, as he does, the Suabians from the ancestors of the English, believes that the former took a High-German dialect in place of their own. Otherwise we may presume, *English* would be spoken at the present moment in Baden and Wurtemburg,—nay, possibly in Switzerland, Bavaria, and Austria, since these were Alemanno-Suevic conquests.

III. *The Suevi Transbadani.*—Between the Saale, the *Bode*, and Hartz is a *Gau* named *Suevon*. This was occupied in the sixth century by a population called by the Frank writers *Suevi*.

The following extracts make them recent colonists,—"Tempore illo quo Alboinus in Italiam ingressus est, Chlothacharius et Sigibertus *Suavos* aliasque gentes in loco illo posuerunt."—Gregory of Tours, v. 15. "Chlotarius et Sigisbertus reges Francorum *Suavos* aliasque gentes in locis, de quibus iidem Saxones exierant posuerunt."—Paul. Diacon. ii. 6.

If the §§ on the Angli and Werini be now referred to, it will be seen that the parts on the Thuringian, Hessian, Slavonic, and Saxon frontiers were parts whereon settlements appear to have been made to a great extent; and it must be remembered that the evidence here is of the kind called *cumulative*, so that, although absolute and unimpeachable reasons for any particular population being considered to have originated in a military colony, cannot be given, there are several populations contiguous to each other, for each of which a small amount of evidence can be collected; the *sum* of the probabilities being a large one.

Suevon, then, as the name of a *Gau*, or *pagus*, we have already seen; as also localities for the *Angli** and the *Werini*.

Besides these, there is, in the same parts, a *Frisonafeld*, or *field of the Frisians*,

These *Suevi* of the *Gau* named *Suevon*, have been conveniently called the *Suevi Transbadani*, *i.e.*, the *Suevi* beyond the *Bode*; since the following passage occurs in Witi-

* See *Epilegomena*, in vv.

kind of Corvey (i. p. 634) "*Suevi* vero *Transbadani* illam quam incolunt regionem eo tempore invaserunt, quo Saxones cum Longobardis Italiam adiere, et ideo *aliis legibus* quam Saxones utuntur."

IV. *The Norsavi, or Nordosquavi.*—In King Theodobert's Epistle to the Emperor Justinian we find the name *Norsavi* of which the more correct form is probably *Nor-suavi*, or *Nordsuavi*—"subactis Thuringis . . . *Norsavorum* gentis nobis placata majestas colla subdidit."—Ducherne, i. 862.

In the Annales Mettenses ad an. 748 (Pertz i. 330), "Pippinus adunato exercitu per Turingiam in Saxoniam veniens fines *Saxonum, quos Nordosquavos vocant*, cum valida manu intravit. Ibique duces gentis asperæ Sclavorum in occursum ejus venerunt, unanimiter auxilium illi contra Saxones ferre parati, pugnatores quasi centum millia. *Saxones* vero, qui *Nordosquavi* vocantur, sub suam ditionem subactos contritosque subegit."

Now Zeuss identifies these *Norsuavi* with the *Suevi Transbadani;* and, for some time, I followed his view. But a little consideration will show that it by no means follows, that because the *Suevi Transbadani* were *Suevi in the North* they were, there, the *Nordsuavi*.

A Lincolnshire colony in the East Riding of Yorkshire, would certainly be Englishmen *North of the Humber*, yet they would not be *North-umbrians*.

I am induced to draw the distinction from the following facts:—

a. All the extracts in Zeuss—the ones on which all my knowledge of the subject rests—call those *Suevi* of whose colonial character there is the clearest evidence,—not *Nordsuavi*, but simply *Suavi*.

b. The *Nord-suavi* are spoken of as a *gens*.

This seems a sufficient reason for disconnecting—

a. The *Suevi* of the settlement founded in Alboin's time from the—

b. *Nord-suavi* of the *gens*, conquered by Theodobert.

The reasoning hitherto has been that the word *Suev-*, originally Keltic, was applied to the Southern Germans exclusively, so that it was Keltic in the way that *Tshud* is Slavonic:

which is a name applied not to all *non*-Slavonic nations indifferently, but to those of the *Ugrian* stock only.*—See *Prolegom.* p. xlix.

But this restriction of its application to a single *non*-Keltic population is by no means necessary; since the word is quite as likely to be in the predicament of the Germanic term Welsh, as in that of the Slavonic *Tshud;* the word *Welsh* being applied not only by the English of England to their fellow-citizens of the principality, but by the Germans of Germany to the *Italians* of Italy.

Now what if *Suev-* be really a root like *wealh*, *i.e.*, a root applicable to two (or more) *non*-Keltic populations, independently of their relations to each other, and with reference to the *non*-Kelticism only? And what if the second of these populations were the *Slavonic?*

If such be the case, more than one difficulty would find its solution.

In the first place, it would account for so many Slavonic populations being designated as *Suevi.*

In the second, it would supply a plausible origin for the word itself.

The phonetic systems of the Slavonic and Keltic, each so peculiar, are each sufficiently different to make such a root as *Serb*, *Sorb*, or *Serv* (the native designation of the Slavonians), take in the mouth of a Gaul, the form *Suav*, *Suab*, or *Suev*—and such I believe to have been the case.

Of course, this view requires to be supported by evidence, that the Kelts *had* a name for the Slavonians at all; and (although the present is not the place where it will be exhibited) such evidence can be given. The hypothesis also requires that this name, as the designation of a *non*-Keltic population, should have been given to a Slavonic nation first. I think that this also can be made probable. If so, we must suppose that the south-eastern Gauls, and the most western of the Saxon and Thuringian Slavonians once met; that the native Slavonic name *Serb* took in Gaul the form *Suev;* that certain Germanic populations displaced those Slavonians, and thus came in contact with Kelts;—lastly, that the name

* The *non*-Slavonic Germans are called *Niemcy.*

originally applied to the Slavonians was extended to the Germans as well.

Be this as it may, it is nearly certain that either the Kelts had no collective name for the *Serbs*, or else, that that name was *Suev*.

In regard to the details of the populations thus named, I believe—

1. That the *Suevi* of Ariovistus were chiefly *Chatti* and Cherusci, along with certain Slavonians from Saxony and Thuringia, and along with certain Gauls belonging to the countries which called him in.

2. That the Suevi of the Alemannic alliance were the true German ancestors of the present Suabians, originally of the Germano-Roman frontier, afterwards (by encroachment) of the Decumates agri — subsequent to the fourth century, perhaps, calling themselves *Suevi*, but till then known by various special names (*Nertereanes*, *Danduti*, *Chatti*, *Burgundians*, &c.) in respect to their ethnology, and in respect to their political relations, sometimes Burgundian sometimes Alemannic.

3. That the Suevi Angili of Ptolemy were—

a. Northern Chatti described by Gallic informants, or—

b. Angles of the Anglo-Slavonic March, who, being *Saxon* Germans, were known to the Gauls to be different from the Chatti, but not known to be different from the Slavonians of the Elbe.

4. That the Saxon Suevi were the same, except that the name *Saxon* is to be accounted for differently. They occupied the country then known as *Saxony*.

5. That the *Suevi* of the *Gau* (*pagus*) named *Suevon* were a colony.

6. That such other Suevi as are mentioned in alliance with any undoubted Slavonic nation east of the probable limits of the true *Alemanno-Suevic* conquests (say the bend of the Danube) were Slavonians, so designated by some of the more eastern Gauls.

7. That the Suevi of Spain were one of two things:—

a. Slavonians in alliance with the *Silingian Vandals* (Slavonic), or—

b. True German Suevi in alliance with the Visigoths. Most probably the former.

8. That the *Suevicum mare* was a name for the Baltic, wholly unconnected with the root in question, and identical with it by accident.

9. That the *Oder* was called the *fluvius Suebus*, because it was the river of the *Suevi* = *Sorbs*.

§ XXI. THE CIUUARI.

In a document quoted by Zeuss as the Weissobrun MS., is the name *Ciuuari*. Zeuss rightly conjectures that the *Ciuuari* were *Suevi*. Surely, he might have added that the word was like *Cant-wære*, the root *Suev* + *wære* = *occupant* = *Suevicolæ*.

§ XXII. THE ARMALAUSI.

In the Tabula Peutingeriana the name ARMALAUSI occurs next to ALEMANNIA.

It seems safe to say that this is a compound—a compound, too, which is *Mœso-Gothic* in form, and a compound of which the *-less*, in words like thought-*less*, is the latter element.

The power of the ARM- is more equivocal. Zeuss makes it mean *shirt-sleeves*; so that *Arma-lausi* = *the bare-armed*.

If it were not for the hybridism. I should be inclined to translate it, the *dis-armed*; the meaning being that some frontier population had been prohibited the wearing of weapons by its conquerors. But the hybridity of a word compounded of the Latin *arma* + the German *-los* is a grave (though not insuperable) objection.*

As the word occurs nowhere else, the question is curious rather than important.

§ XXIII. THE LENTIENSES AND BRISGAVI.

The former of these are mentioned by Ammianus in his history of the reigns of Constantius and of Gratian; the latter occurs in the Notitia Imperii.

* See § *Ripuarii*.

The interest that attaches to these names arises from their being amongst the first members of the Alemanno-Suevic confederacy who are mentioned by specific and particular names.

Their area of encroachment was Switzerland, and part of Bavaria (Helvetia and Rhætia), so that they are amongst the ancestors of the present Swiss.

The name Bris-*gavi* shows the antiquity of the word *Gau* =*pagus*, as in Ar-*gau*, Thur-*gau*. See Kemble's Saxons in England—*On the Gà and Scìre.*

§ XXIV. THE BUCCINOBANTES.

Mentioned by Ammianus; and differing from the Lentienses and Brisgavi only in having penetrated into *Hesse* —*i.e.*, having made their movements in a northern direction.

§ XXV. THE BRIGONENSES.

Germans who, in the fifth century penetrated as far westwards as the neighbourhood of Troyes, and who are mentioned in a Life of St. Lupus, who died A.D. 479.

Whether these four populations gave their names to the localities of which they possessed themselves, or took them from them, is uncertain.

§ XXVI. THE OBII.

We are now passing from the tribes more especially connected with the *Suevi* and *Alemanni* of the Rhine, to nations and confederacies whose scene of action is the Middle and Lower Danube.

The *Obii* stand at the head of this division. They do so, however, because a notice of them is an element in the criticism that has to be applied to the Langobards, Heruli, and other populations more important.

The form *Obii* is from a *Greek* writer, and occurs in a fragment of Petrus Patricius:—*Ὅτι Λαγγιϐάρδων καὶ Ὀϐίων ἑξακισχιλίων Ἴστρον περαιωθέντων, τῶν περὶ Βίνδικα ἱππέων ἐξελασάντων καὶ τῶν ἀμφὶ Κάνδιδον πεζῶν ἐπιφθασάντων, εἰς παντελῆ φυγὴν οἱ βάρϐαροι ἐτράποντο. Ἐφ'*

οἷς οὕτω πραχθεῖσιν ἐν δέει καταστάντες ἐκ πρώτης ἐπιχειρήσεως οἱ βάρϐαροι, πρέσϐεις παρὰ Αἴλιον Βάσσον τὴν Παιονίαν διέποντα στέλλουσι, Βαλλομάριόν τε τὸν βασιλέα Μαρκομάννων καὶ ἑτέρους δέκα, κατ' ἔθνος ἐπιλεξάμενοι ἕνα. Καὶ ὅρκοις τὴν εἰρήνην οἱ πρέσϐεις πιστωσάμενοι οἴκαδε χωροῦσιν.

The *Greek* source is important; since, in Greek, the *b* may have been sounded as *v;* so that word may have been *Ovii* to the ear.

Two other facts must be added:—

1. That forms like *Attuarii*, as opposed to *Chattuarii*, show the likelihood of an initial *ch* having been lost.

2. That most German national names could end either in -*n*, or in a vowel—*Seaxe* and *Seaxan*, &c.

Putting all this together we find that the following legitimate changes may give us *Obii*, *Ovii*, *Oviones*, *Chaviones*, *Aviones*—this latter being a population we have met with before, in the *north*.

Now few nations, during the time of their historical prominence, were in closer political relations with the Langobardi than the Heruli—and with the *Chaviones* the Heruli were in close political relation also:—"Cum omnes barbaræ nationes excidium universæ Galliæ minarentur, neque solum Burgundiones et Alamanni, sed et *Chaviones Eruli*que, viribus primi barbarorum, locis ultimi, præcipiti impetu in has provincias irruissent, quis deus tam insperatam salutem nobis attulisset, nisi tu adfuisses? — *Chaviones* tamen *Erulos*que . . aperto Marte, atque uno impetu perculisti, non universo ad id prœlium usus exercitu, sed paucis cohortibus.—Ita cuncti *Chaviones*, *Eruli*que cuncti tanta internecione cæsi interfectique sunt, ut exstinctos eos relictis domi conjugibus ac matribus non profugus aliquis prœlio, sed victoriæ tuæ gloria nuntiaret."—Mamertini Paneg. Maximiano Aug. dictus (an. 289), c. 5. "Laurea illa Rhætica et illa Sarmatica te, Maximiane, fecerunt pio gaudio triumphare. Itidem hic gens *Chavionum Erulorum*que deleta, transrhenana victoria et domitis oppressa Francis bella piratica Diocletianum votorum compotem reddiderunt."—Ejusd. Paneg. Genethl. Maxim. Aug. dict. (an. 291), c. 7.

Taking this statement as I find it, I admit that the *Chaviones, a nation of northern Germany, may be brought as far south as the Danube.*

§ XXVII. THE LANGOBARDI OF LOMBARDY.

The first notice of these is that of Petrus Patricius.—See § *Obii.*

Then, after a long silence as to their acts, they appear on the middle Danube, with the (so-called) traditions of Paulus Diaconus (See *Epilegomena*, § VI.), as the Lombards of Lombardy.

A shade of doubt (and to my mind it is a deep one) lies in the fact of their previous name having been *Winili*, a form suspiciously like *Venedi*. Still they are at least (if Slavonians) Slavonians who, by the time they became the Lombards of Lombardy, were thoroughly Germanized.

Their descent from the Lango-bards of Tacitus and Ptolemy is a difficult question. Their locality in *Rugiland* proves nothing: it is probably the land of the *Rugii* of the Danube—not that of the Rugii of Tacitus.

Golandia has been supposed to be *Goth*-landia (=*Goth*-land); but we must take the reading as we find it—especially as there was a Lithuanic nation called *Galindæ*.

The terminations *-aib* in Bant-*aib* and Wurgond-*aib* have been supposed to be the German *-eib:* concerning which Mr. Kemble, after explaining a word often mentioned in the present pages * (*Gau*), adds, in a note, that the synonym *Eib* is less common.

* "Next in order of constitution, if not of time, is the union of two or three marks, in a federal bond for purposes of a religious, judicial or even political character. The technical name for such a union is, in Germany, a *Gau* or *Bant;* in England the ancient name Gá has been almost universally superseded by that of Scír, or Shire. For the most part the natural divisions of the county are the divisions also of the Gá; and the size of this depends upon such accidental limits, as well as upon the character and dispositions of the several collective bodies, which we have called Marks.

"The Gá is the second and final form of unsevered possession, for every larger aggregate is but the result of a gradual reduction of such districts,

But is this the only analysis of the two words—Banthaib and Wurcondaib? I think not. The commonest of all the terminations of the towns of Dacia was *dava*—Rusi-*dava*, &c., as may be seen by going no further than Arrowsmith's map.

Again, *Bantaib* is admitted by Zeuss to mean the *-taib* (or *-aib*) of the Slavonic *Antes*.* As for the root *Wurcond*, it is, at least, as likely to represent the *Urugund-* in *Urugundi*, as the *Burg-* in the true *Burgundians*.

To all this must be added the remarks in the note in v. *Longobardi*, suggesting that from the fact of the term being an epithet rather than a separate substantive name, there is a likelihood of there having been more *Longobards* than one, and that independent of ethnological affinity.

Upon the whole, although the evidence of the Lombards having originally been Goths or Germans, and the evidence of their having effected a migration from north to south, are not wholly unexceptionable, less objections lie against them than against any other similar instance: and I only consider it doubtful when it is made the basis of any ulterior deductions—such as that of making some very doubtful Germans German, because they stood in certain relations to the Lombards of Lombardy.

Perhaps the structure of the Lombard armaments may have been like that of the Vandals,—German in respect to its chiefs, Slavonic in respect to the bulk of the forces; in which case the Langobardi may have been the analogues of the Astingi; in which case, too, they may have represented the Langobardi of Tacitus. The distant migration of a *cognatio* or *silsceaft* seeking war, is more likely than the distant

under a higher political or administrative unity, different only in degree, and not in kind from what prevailed individually in each.

"The kingdom is only a larger Gá than ordinary, indeed the Gá itself was the original kingdom. But the unsevered possession or property which we thus find in the Gá is by no means to be considered in the same light as that which has been described in the Mark. The inhabitants are settled as Markman, not as Gâmen; the cultivated land which lies within the limit of the larger community is all distributed into smaller ones."—Saxons in England, vol. i. 73.

* Probably, an eastern form of the word *Wend*.

migration of a nation, broken up and weakened, as we know the northern Lombards to have been.

§ XXVIII. THE GEPIDÆ.

The Gepidæ are mentioned in the Traveller's Song as Gifþas.

Their date and area are those of the Heruli and Longobards.

The tradition and the gloss *Gepanta* may be seen in Jornandes, *Epilegomena*, § v.

In Capitolinus we find notice of the *Si-cobotes* in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, as members of the Marcomannic confederacy in the Marcomannic war. This has been supposed to = *Gepidæ* + the prefix *Si-* (or Sig-), just as was supposed to be the case with *Si*-cambri.

Vopiscus, in his Life of Probus first mentions *Gepidæ*—"Cum et ex aliis gentibus plerosque pariter transtulisset, id est ex *Gepidis*, Grautungis et Vandalis, illi omnes fidem fregerunt."—Prob. c. 18.

Mamertinus mentions their wars with the *Tervings*. More important, however, were their political relations with the Longobards, the Avars, and the Thaifal.

Their seat was the Middle Danube, in Dacia; their chief King, *Fastida*, a name by no means unequivocally German or Gothic.

Arda-*rich*, another chief, has a more unequivocal name.

Jornandes separates them from the Winidæ—"In qua Scythia prima ab occidente gens sedit *Gepidarum*, quæ magnis opinatisque ambitur fluminibus. Nam Tisianus per aquilonem ejus corumque discurrit. Ab africo vero magnus ipse Danubius, ab euro fluvius Tausis secat, qui rapidus ac verticosus in Histri fluenta furens devolvitur. Introrsus illi Dacia est ad coronæ speciem arduis Alpibus emunita, juxta quorum sinistrum latus . . . *Winidarum* natio populosa consedit."—C. 5.

The parts about Singidunum and Sirmium are their most definite localities.

They afterwards became subject to the Huns.

An unknown writer of the ninth century says, "De Gepidis autem *quidam adhuc ibi resident*."

Procopius makes them Goths; but his language may apply to their political relations, besides which, he connects them with the *Vandals*, and says that they were originally called *Sauromatæ* and *Melanchlæni*—Γοτθικὰ ἔθνη πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα πρότερόν τε ἦν καὶ τανῦν ἐστι, τὰ δὲ δὴ πάντων μέγιστά τε καὶ ἀξιολογώτατα Γότθοι τέ εἰσι καὶ Βανδίλοι καὶ Οὐϊσίγοτθοι καὶ Γήπαιδες. Πάλαι μέντοι Σαυρομάται καὶ Μελάγχλαινοι ὠνομάζοντο· εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ καὶ Γετικὰ ἔθνη ταῦτ' ἐκάλουν. Οὗτοι ἅπαντες ὀνόμασι μὲν ἀλλήλων διαφέρουσιν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, ἄλλῳ δὲ τῶν πάντων οὐδενὶ διαλλάσσουσι. Λευκοὶ γὰρ ἅπαντες τὰ σώματά τέ εἰσι καὶ τὰς κόμας ξανθοὶ, εὐμήκεις τε καὶ ἀγαθοὶ τὰς ὄψεις, καὶ νόμοις μὲν τοῖς αὐτοῖς χρῶνται, ὁμοίως δὲ τὰ ἐς τὸν θεὸν αὐτοῖς ἤσκηται. Τῆς γὰρ Ἀρείου δόξης εἰσιν ἅπαντες, φωνή τε αὐτοῖς ἐστι μία, Γοτθικὴ λεγομένη, καί μοι δοκοῦν ἐξ ἑνὸς μὲν εἶναι ἅπαντες τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθνους, ὀνόμασι δὲ ὕστερον τῶν ἑκάστοις ἡγησαμένων διακεκρίσθαι.—Bell. Vandal. i. 2. Πολλῷ δὲ ἄποθεν (τῆς Μαιώτιδος) Γότθοι τε καὶ Οὐϊσίγοτθοι καὶ Βανδίλοι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα Γοτθικὰ γένη ξύμπαντα ἵδρυντο.—Bell. Goth. iv. 5.

He adds, too, Σκίρρους τε καὶ Ἀλανοὺς καὶ ἄλλα Γόθικα ἔθνη.—Bell. Goth. i. 1. Now the Alans were, assuredly, no Goths in ethnology. See § *Alani*.

The evidence, then, in favour of their being Goths or Germans, is that of so many others. Their alliances, and the names of some of their leaders, along with a (so-called) tradition are in their favour; their locality against them. So is the gloss *Gepanta*. So is the express evidence of Procopius.

§ XXIX. THE THAIFALÆ.

These are first mentioned by Mamertinus, A.D. 291: their locality being on the Middle Danube, and their chief political relations with the *Thervings*, *Vandals*, *Gepidæ*, *Ostro-Goths*, and *Limigantes*.

Zosimus, an indifferent authority, makes them Scythians: —Ἐπελθόντων δὲ Θαϊφάλων, Σκυθικοῦ γένους, ἱππεῦσι πεντακοσίοις, οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀντετάξατο τούτοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς δυνάμεως ἀποβαλὼν, καὶ τὰ μέχρι τοῦ χάρακος

αὐτοὺς ληϊζομένους ἰδὼν, ἀγαπητῶς ἀποδρὰς διεσώθη.—ii. 34.

The name of one of their chiefs is *Farnobius*, a name of doubtful origin; but as Ammianus expressly calls him a *Goth*, he must be considered as such:—"Hanc (Frigeridus) Gothorum optimatem Farnobium cum vastatoriis globis vagantem licentius occupavit, ducentemque *Taifalos*, nuper in societatem adhibitos: qui, si dignum est dici, nostris ignotarum gentium terrore dispersis, transiere flumen direpturi vacua defensoribus loca."—xxxi. 9.

"Beatus Senoch, gente *Theiphalus*, Pictavi pagi, quem *Theiphaliam* vocant, oriundus fuit" (Vitæ Patrum 15), suggests the presence of *Thaifali* in France. If so, a settlement as a military colony would best explain it.

Infamous for their unnatural habits (which they shared along with the Heruli), they are described by Ammianus in the following passage:—"Hanc *Taifalorum* gentem turpem ac obscœnæ vitæ flagitiis ita accepimus mersam, ut apud eos nefandi concubitus fœdere copulentur maribus puberes, ætatis viriditatem in eorum pollutis usibus consumturi. Porro si qui jam adultus aprum exceperit solus, vel interemerit ursum immanem, colluvione liberatur incesti."

They were probably Slavonic; the *phal-* being the *-hal-* in Victo-*hali*, and the *-val* in Nahar-*vali*.

§ XXX. THE VANDALS.

The reasons in favour of the *Vandals* being considered German, are—

1. Authors so respectable as Pliny (the first writer who mentions them) and Tacitus, place them under the term *Germani*.

2. Their chief political connections are with the undoubtedly German Alemanno-Suevi, and Goths proper.

3. The names of their leaders are almost exclusively German—Gonde-*ric*, Gense-*ric*, &c.

The value of the first of these facts is questioned in almost every page of the present volume.

The second is neutralized by such extracts as the following

—which connect them with the equally unequivocally Sarmatian Jazyges;—πρὸς δὲ καὶ, ἵνα μήτε τοῖς Ἰάζυξι, μήτε τοῖς Βούρροις, μήτε τοῖς Βανδήλοις πολεμῶσιν.—Dio Cass. lxxii. p. 1204, Reim.

The third is a really substantial reason, and would be valid if there were nothing to set against it.

Against it, however, stand,—

1. The *name* of the people themselves, which is probably a South-German form of the well-known root, *V-nd*, applied by the Germans in general to the Slavonians in general.

2. The *localities*. In no part of the true and undoubted Germanic area do we meet with any form of the root *V-nd-l*, and no where do we find the mention of them as *Germanic*, other than cursory and incidental. Neither Pliny nor Tacitus gives us more than the name.

3. The different points of the Roman frontier, upon which we meet with Vandals, are so distant, as make it likely that the population, known by the name *Vandal*, was of great extent; whilst great extent on the part of a population is *primâ facie* evidence of the name being *general*.

Hence, I believe that the *Venedi* of the Germans of the Baltic, were the *Vand-ali* of the Germans of the Danube, and *vice versâ*.

Of these Slavonic populations, thus known under a German name, the two most important were—

1. The *Vandals* of the Daco-Pannonian frontier, whose scene of action was the Middle and Lower Danube, whose political relations were with the Goths proper, and who first became formidable to the Romans under their German name during the Marcomannic war. The ethnological affinities of these were more specially with the *Lygii*, and their present representatives are the more southern branches of the Poles, along with some of the more northern Slovaks.

2. Vandals of the south-western frontier.—Those, more important than the others, were the Sorabians of Saxony, Silesia, and the more eastern parts of Thuringia and Franconia; *i.e.*, the Slavonians of the Upper Maine, the Upper Elbe, and the Saale, their scene of action being in the first

instance Gaul, subsequently Spain, finally Africa; their political relations being with the Suevi, Alemanni, Burgundians, and the southern Franks. Their ancestors were some of the Suevi of Tacitus, more especially the Semnones; their descendants the present Sorbs of Saxony and *Silesia*.

The statement of Idatius in Chronicon Roncallense is, that the Vandals of Spain (*Andal*-usian Spain more particularly) were *Wandali Silingi*. These are admitted by Zeuss to have been the Σίλιγγαι of Ptolemy; as well as to have been the occupants of parts so near *Silesia* as Upper Lusatia (p. 445).

Again, the *pagus Sil*-ensis is admitted to be a Latin form of the Slavonic *Zlas*-ane and *Sleenz*-ane, the older forms of the present German *Schles*-ien, and English *Sil*-esia (p. 663).

Yet the similarity between all these forms, and the name Σίλιγγ-*αι* (applied to the same locality) is *not* admitted.

Admitting it myself, I consider the Vandals of Andal-*usia*, the Vandals of Genseric, and the Vandals of Gelimer to have been no Germans, but Slavonian *Serbs*, chiefly from Saxony, but in some cases from parts so far east as *Silesia*, in which country, the Vandals of the south-western frontier may have come in contact with those of the south-eastern.

This shows that the separation between the two branches of the Wandals must not be carried too far; indeed, we are at liberty to take Silesia as a central point, and look upon the movements of the Vandals, whose alliance was with the Goths, and the Vandals, whose alliance was with the Alemanni, as blows against the majesty of Rome struck right and left by the same people.

At any rate, the Germanic leaders of each belonged to one and the same *cognatio* of *sibsceaft*; the Vandal equivalent to the Balt-*ungs* of the Visi-goths, and the Amal-*ungs* of the Ostro-goths, being the *Ast*-ings, a name which we have in two forms one Mœso-Gothic, and one Old High German.

In the *Old* High German the *s* or *z* of the Mœso-Gothic becomes *-r*; *e.g.*, the comparative degree in *r*, which in

English is sweet-*er* and in Old High German suats-*iro*, was, in Mœso-Gothic, *sut-iza*. So also the Old High German plint-*er* (= blind = cæc-*us*) is in Mœso-Gothic blind-*s*.

In like manner, these Ast-ings, when they are at the head of those Vandals, whose chief alliance was with the *Goths*, are designated by the form in -*s*, the Gothic forms being Azd-ing-ôs; whereas, when they command the Vandals of Andalusia and Africa, the Vandals, whose alliance was with the Alemanni, Suevi, Burgundians, and other *High* German populations, they are Gar-ding-*s*, the Old High German form being Gar-ding-*ar*.

The reasons for considering *Asting* (*Garding*) to have been the name of a family, lie in the following extracts.

"Si inter *Hasdirigorum* (*Hasdingorum?*) stirpem retinuissetis Amali sanguinis purpuream dignitatem."—Cass. Var. ix. 1.

Γελιμέρα αὐτον σὺν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῦ ἔθνους, οὓς ἐκάλουν Ἀστίγγους οἱ βάρβαροι.—Lydus de Magistrat. p. 248.

"Belisarius Gunthimer et Gebamundum *Gardingos* regis fratres perimit."—Chron. Roncall. ii. 364.

"Videntibus cunctis sacerdotibus Dei, senioribusque palatii atque *Gardingis*."—Legg. Wisigoth. lib. II. tit. i. 1.

"Seu sit dux aut comes, thiufadus aut vicarius, *Gardingus* vel quælibet persona."—Lib. IX. tit. ii. 8.

"Si majoris loci fuerit persona, id est dux, comes, sive etiam *Gardingus*."—Lib. IX. tit. ii. 9.

"Secundus est canon de accusatis sacerdotibus, seu etiam optimatibus palatii atque *Gardingis*."—Lib. XII. tit. i. 3.

"Benedicta claro genere exorta atque ex *Gardingo* regis sponsa."—Vita Sanct. Fructuosi (Mabill. Sæc. ii. 587.)

The chief passage that modifies this view, is the following from Dion Cass. lxxi. Ἄστιγγοι δὲ, ὧν Ῥᾶός τε καὶ Ῥάπτος ἡγοῦντο, ἦλθον μὲν ἐς τὴν Δακίαν οἰκῆσαι, ἐλπίδι τοῦ καὶ χρήματα καὶ χώραν ἐπὶ συμμαχίᾳ λήψεσθαι· μὴ τυχόντες δὲ αὐτῶν, παρεκατέθεντο τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τῷ Κλήμεντι, ὡς καὶ τὴν τῶν Κοστουβώκων χώραν τοῖς ὅπλοις κτησόμενοι· νικήσαντες δὲ ἐκείνους καὶ τὴν Δακίαν οὐδὲν ἧττον ἐλύπουν. Δείσαντες δὲ οἱ Δάγκριγοι, μὴ καὶ ὁ Κλήμης φοβηθεὶς, σφᾶς ἐς τὴν γῆν,

ἣν αὐτοὶ ἐνῴκουν, ἐσαγάγῃ, ἐπέθεντο αὐτοῖς μὴ προσδεχομένοις καὶ πολὺ ἐκράτησαν· ὥστε μηδὲν ἔτι πολέμιον τοὺς Ἀστίγγους πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους πρᾶξαι, πολλὰ δὲ δὴ τὸν Μάρκον ἱκετεύσαντας, χρήματά τε παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν καὶ χώραν γε ἀπαιτῆσαι, ἄν γέ τι κακὸν τοὺς τότε πολεμοῦντάς οἱ δράσωσι. Καὶ οὗτοι μὲν ἔπραξάν τι ὧν ὑπέσχοντο.

This, however, can be reconciled with previous passages, by considering the *Asting-as* (or *Gardingar*) to have been a free company, recruiting itself on Slavonic ground, so much so as to form the Germanic nucleus to what was really a Vandal (or Slavonic) force.

The *Lacr*-ings, mentioned also by Dion, may have been similar adventurers.

Hence the names Genseric, &c., are the names of *Astings* (or *Gardings*); and the German blood amongst the Vandals was limited to the *cognatio* or *silsceaft* of their German leaders; and the Vandals are German only so far as they are Astings—which is only very partially.

§ XXXI. THE RUGII.

The *pugnax Rugus* is mentioned by Sidonius Apollinaris:

> Barbaries totas in te transfuderat arctos,
> Gallia, pugnacem *Rugum* comitante Gelono;
> Gepida trux sequitur, Scirum Burgundio cogit:
> Chunus, Bellonotus, Neurus, Basterna, Toringus,
> Bructerus, ulvosa quem vel Nicer abluit unda,
> Prorumpit Francus.—Carm. vii. 320.

They first appear prominently in history about A.D. 475; their area being the parts on each side of the Middle Danube; their chiefs Flaccitheus, Feletheus, Fava, and Frideric, the last two of whom are deposed by Odoacer, the great central point in the ethnology of the Rugii, and the three forthcoming populations:*—"Quapropter rex Otachar *Rugis* intulit bellum, quibus etiam devictis, et *Fridericho fugato*, *patre quoque Fava capto*, eum ad Italiam cum noxia conjuge supra memorata, videlicet Gisa, transmigravit. Post audiens idem Odachar

* Heruli, Turcilingi, and Sciri.

Friderichum ad propria revertisse, statim fratrem suum misit cum multis exercitibus Aonulfum, ante quem denuo *fugiens Friderichus*, ad Theodoricum regem, qui tunc apud Novam civitatem provinciæ Mœsiæ morabatur, profectus est."—Eugipp. c. 45. "Adunatis Odoachar gentibus, quæ ejus ditioni parebant, . . venit in *Rugiland*, pugnavitque cum *Rugis*, ultimaque eos clade conficiens, *Feletheum* insuper eorum regem (qui et *Feva* dictus est) extinxit. Vastataque omni provincia, Italiam repetens, copiosam secum captivorum multitudinem abduxit."—Paul. Diac. i. 19.

Naturally hostile to the usurper Odoacer, the Rugii join Theodoric the Ostrogoth, and, in the reign of Justinian, we hear of *Rugii* in Italy, distinct in many points from the Goths, —Ἀφίκοντο (*viz.*, the *Heruli*) ἐς χώραν, ᾗ δὴ ῾Ρογοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ᾤκηντο, οἳ τῷ Γότθων στρατῷ ἀναμιχθέντες ἐς Ἰταλίαν ἐχώρησαν. — Proc. B. Goth. ii. 14. Οἱ δὲ ῾Ρογοὶ οὗτοι ἔθνος μέν εἰσι Γοτθικὸν, αὐτόνομοί τε τὸ παλαιὸν ἐβίων. Θευδερίχου δὲ αὐτοὺς τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς προσεταιρισαμένου ξὺν ἄλλοις τισὶν ἔθνεσιν, ἔς τε τὸ γένος ἀπεκέκριντο καὶ ξὺν αὐτοῖς ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους ἅπαντα ἔπρασσον. Γυναιξὶ μέντοι ὡς ἥκιστα ἐπιμιγνύμενοι ἀλλοτρίαις, ἀκραιφνέσι παίδων διαδοχαῖς τὸ τοῦ ἔθνους ὄνομα ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς διεσώσαντο.—Id. iii. 2.

Now the *Rugi*-land of these *Rugii* was on the Danube. What connects them with the *Rugii* of Tacitus?

a. The similarity of name.

b. The account of Jornandes.

Jornandes writes that the Goths expelled the *Ulm-erugi*:— "Mox promoventes (scil. *Gothi*) ad sedes *Ulm*erugorum qui tunc Oceani ripas insidebant, castra metati sunt, eosque commisso prœlio propriis sedibus pepulerunt." The form *Ulm*-erugi indicates a Gothic rather than a Latin, a homesprung rather than an exotic legend. It is a compound of the Scandinavian *holm*=*holm*=*flat land by a river, lake, or sea*, and is exactly the form *Holmrygir* of Snorro.

Whatever these Rugii were in respect to their ethnology, the names of some of their chiefs (*e.g.*, *Frideric*) were German.

They were also in geographical contact with the undoubtedly Germanic Ostrogoths, as well as with the Langobardi.

But then we have the expression, *Turc-ilingus* sive *Rugius*. The ethnology of the *Rugii*, *Heruli*, *Sciri*, and *Turcilingi* is best considered after all these have been treated in detail.

§ XXXII. THE HERULI.

The first historical actions of a population named *Heruli* are referred to the reign of Claudius.

But the authors who do this are not contemporary with the events related.

This, however, is not important. Mamertinus, writing about A.D. 289, *is* so. See extract in § *Obii*.

Zozimus connects them with the *Peucini* and Goths:—'Εκ τῶν προλαβουσῶν ἐπαρθέντες (*scil.* Σκύθαι) ἐφόδων, 'Ερούλους καὶ Πεύκας καὶ Γότθους παραλαβόντες καὶ περὶ τὸν Τύραν ποταμὸν ἀθροισθέντες, . . ἔπλεον ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσω.

Syncellus makes Greece and Thrace their theatre of war:—Τότε καὶ Αἴρουλοι πεντακοσίαις ναυσὶ διὰ τῆς Μαιώτιδος λίμνης ἐπὶ τὸν Πόντον διαπλεύσαντες, τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ Χρυσόπολιν κατέλαβον . . . καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν φθάσαντες ἐμπιπρῶσι τὰς Ἀθήνας, Κόρινθόν τε καὶ Σπάρτην καὶ τὸ Ἄργος καὶ τὴν ὅλην Ἀχαΐαν κατέδραμον . . τότε Ναυλοβάτος ὁ τῶν Αἰρούλων ἡγούμενος Γαλιήνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἔκδοτον, ὑπατικῆς ἠξιώθη τιμῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ.—Chronograph. p. 382, edit. Par.

Jornandes makes them become subjected to Hermanric:—"Non passus est nisi et gentem *Herulorum*, quibus præerat Alaricus, magna ex parte trucidatam, reliquam suæ subigeret ditioni. Nam prædicta gens (Ablavio historico referente) *juxta Mæotidas paludes habitans* in locis stagnantibus, quas Græci hele vocant, Heruli nominati sunt: gens quanto *velox*, eo amplius superbissima. Sed quamvis *velocitas* eorum ab aliis sæpe bellantibus eos tutaretur, Gothorum tamen stabilitati subjacuit et tarditati."—De Reb. Get. xxiii.

The commentary upon Jornandes' etymology is the following note in the Etymologia Magna:—"Ελουρος. Εὐθεῖα.

Ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖσε ἑλῶν Ἕλουροι κέκληνται. Δέξιππος ἐν δωδεκάτῳ χρονικῶν. Καὶ γράφεται διὰ τοῦ ε ψιλοῦ.

In the reign of Augustulus they became formidable, and Odoacer, the king of the Heruli, and the centre of the group of Rugii, Turcilingi, and Sciri, shares the historical prominence of Theodoric, Attila, Clovis, and the other great conquerors of that century.

Not that their relations were thus limited. Besides, the Chaviones (for which see § *Obii*) of Mamertinus, Ammianus mentions *Æruli* and *Eruli* in alliance with the *Batavi*, and more than one author carries their maraudings as far as Spain :—"De *Erulorum* gente septem navibus in Lucensi litore aliquanti advecti, viri ferme cccc. expediti, superventu multitudinis congregatæ duobus tantum ex suo numero effugantur occisis : qui ad sedes proprias redeuntes, Cantabriarum et Varduliarum loca maritima crudelissime deprædati sunt."—Idatii Chron. ad A.D. 455.

Their first appearance, then, in history, takes place on the Lower Danube, if not on the Lower Don, and the Palus Mæotis.

Their physiognomy is thus described by Sidonius :—

> "Hic glaucis Herulus genis vagatur,
> Imos Oceani colens recessus,
> Algoso prope concolor profundo."

The *glaucæ genæ* is a (so called) Mongolian character.

Procopius gives the following remarkable account of a *Herulian* migration :—Ἡνίκα Ἔρουλοι Λαγγοβαρδῶν ἡσσηθέντες τῇ μάχῃ ἐξ ἠθῶν τῶν πατρίων ἔστησαν, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ μοι ἔμπροσθεν δεδιήγηται, ᾠκήσαντο ἐς τὰ ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς χωρία, οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι Ἴστρον ποταμὸν διαβαίνειν οὐδαμῇ ἔγνωσαν, ἀλλ' ἐς αὐτάς που τὰς ἐσχατιὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱδρύσαντο· οὕτω γοῦν πολλῶν ἐκ τοῦ βασιλείου αἵματος ἡγουμένων σφίσιν ἤμειψαν μὲν τὰ Σκλαβηνῶν ἔθνη ἐφεξῆς ἅπαντα, ἔρημον δὲ χώραν διαβάντες ἐνθένδε πολλὴν ἐς τοὺς Οὐάρνους καλουμένους ἐχώρησαν. Μεθ' οὓς δὴ καὶ Δανῶν τὰ ἔθνη παρέδραμον, οὐ βιαζομένων σφᾶς τῶν τῇδε βαρβάρων. Ἐνθένδε τε ἐς ὠκεανὸν ἀφικόμενοι ἐναυτίλλοντο, Θούλῃ τε προσχόντες τῇ νήσῳ αὐτοῦ ἔμειναν . . . (Θουλι-

τῶν) ἔθνος ἐν πολυάνθρωπον οἱ Γαυτοί εἰσι, παρ' οὓς δὴ Ἐρούλων τότε οἱ ἐπηλύται ἱδρύσαντο. — Procop. Bell. Goth. ii. 15.

The Heruli had also political relations with the Gepidæ.

§ XXXIII. THE BRENTI.

The notice of this name arises out of that of the Heruli.

In the reign of Justinian, and in the war against Narses, a certain *Sinduala* (Sindewald, Σινδουὰλ, Σινδούαλδος) is mentioned as king (*ἡγέμων, στράτηγος*, tyrannus) of the *Eruli.*

The same is mentioned as a *rex Brentorum*—"Habuit Narses certamen adversus *Sinduald Brentorum regem*, qui adhuc de *Herulorum* stirpe remanserat, quem secum in Italiam veniens simul Odoacar adduxerat."—Gest. Lang. ii. 3.

The name occurs nowhere else.

§ XXXIV. THE TURCILINGI.

The first writers that mention this people are Jornandes and Paulus Diaconus.

They first appear in history in the reign of Augustulus.

Their political relations are with the Heruli, Rugii, and Sciri; Odoacer being the chief that forms the centre of the confederation.

Their areas of action are the parts between the Danube and Italy.

Their name is a German in form; the *-ling* belonging to that language.

The radical part, however, is neither German nor Slavonic.

The Huns, a *Turk* population, are already beginning to appear in Europe.

Can these *Turci*-lingi be *Turks?*

This is partly answered in § *Sciri*, and partly elsewhere.

§ XXXV. THE SCIRI.

Respecting the *Sciri*, even Grimm is not prepared to say more than that *if they were not Gothic, they were con-*

nected with the Goths in many points—"*Wo nicht Gothischen, doch mit den Gothen in vielfacher berührung.*" — D. S. i. p. 465.

Pliny's evidence is the earliest. He places them on the Baltic rather than elsewhere. "Nec minor opinione Eningia. Quidam hæc habitari ad Vistulam fluvium a Sarmatis, Venedis, *Sciris*, *Hirris*, tradunt."

The first complication here occurring, is the similarity of the names *Hirri* and *Sciri*. Strange that really different populations, with names so alike, should occupy contiguous localities. No other writer mentions the *Hirri*, and I think they are but *Sciri* under another name—*i.e.*, a name taken from a different dialect.

Neither does any other writer place any *Sciri* in the *north*.

The Olbian Inscription mentions the Σκίροι, along with the *Γάλαται*.

Stephanus Byzantinus speaks of *Σκίροι, Γαλάτικον ἔθνος*.

Procopius joins the *Σκίροι* with the Goths and Alans.

Jornandes mentions the *Sciri* as either subjects or allies of Odoacer.

If we take these statements without criticism, we find difficulties that even the assumption of migrations will not account for; since, although a movement from the Baltic to the Danube, between the time of Pliny and Procopius, will account for their presence on that river, it is of no avail for the *Sciri* of the Olbian Inscription—which is generally referred to a period *anterior* to the time of Pliny, *i.e.*, the first or second century B.C.

Sidonius makes the *Sciri* part of *Attila's* army.

Jornandes connects them with the *Alans*—"*Sciri* et Satagarii et *cœteri* Alanorum, cum duce suo, nomine Candax, Scythiam minorem, inferioremque Mœsiam accepere." — De Reb. Get. 49, 50.

The evidence of Jornandes is important, since Peria, the notary of Candax, was his grandfather.

Now, as we are much surer of the Sciri of Jornandes on the Danube, than of those of Pliny, their ethnology will be considered first.

a. They were either Germans, or under German leaders:

since we have the names of two of their leaders, *Edica* and *Wulf*, both of which are German.

b. There were Sciri as far east as Bavaria; since a Bavarian legend mentions *Eticho* and *Welf* in connection with the *Scherezêne Wald* = *nemus Scirorum* = the present *Scharnitz* (a Slavonic name) on the Iser.

c. The name can be connected with *Steyer-mark* = *Styria* = the March of the *Styri* (= *Sciri*). Not only is the change from *sc-* to *st-* (and *vice versâ*) common (especially in Slavonic names, of which it is, perhaps, *primâ facie* evidence), but a Bavarian count called Wernher von *Schiern* in one place, is called Comes de *Stira* in Bavaria, in Godfrey of Viterbo, ad an. 955. Add to this, that, amongst the names of the Counts of *Steyer*mark Ottachar (Odoacer) is a common one.

All this, is from the D. S. i. 464—468.

But the *Sciri* and *Turcilingi* were closely united—politically at least; and, as already stated, the *Turc*-ilingi have the root *Turk*, as part of their evidently derivative name.

And the Sciri have been already called an *Alan* population—the Alans being, almost certainly, Turk.

Add to this that the Sciri were in alliance with the Turk *Huns*—Ὁ δὲ Οὔλδις (ὁ ἡγούμενος τῶν Οὔννων) πρὸς τὸ πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ μόλις διεσώθη, πολλοὺς ἀποβαλὼν, ἄρδην δὲ τοὺς καλουμένους Σκίρους. Ἔθνος δὲ τοῦτο βάρβαρον, ἱκανῶς πολυάνθρωπον, πρὶν τοιᾶδε περιπεσεῖν συμφορᾷ. Ὑστερήσαντες γὰρ ἐν τῇ φυγῇ, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀνῃρέθησαν, οἱ δὲ ζωγρηθέντες, δέσμιοι πρὸς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἐξεπέμφθησαν. Δόξαν δὲ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν διανεῖμαι τούτους, μή τι πλῆθος ὄντες νεωτερίσωσι· τοὺς μὲν ἐπ' ὀλίγοις τιμήμασι ἀπέδοντο, τοὺς δὲ πολλοῖς προῖκα δουλεύειν παρέδοσαν, ἐπὶ τὸ μήτε Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, μήτε πάσης Εὐρώπης ἐπιβαίνειν, καὶ τῇ μέσῃ θαλάσσῃ χωρίζεσθαι τὸν ἐγνωσμένον αὐτοῖς τόπον· ἐκ τούτων τε πλῆθος ἄπρατον περιλειφθὲν ἄλλος ἀλλαχῇ διατρίβειν ἐτάχθησαν. Πολλοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Βιθυνίας τεθέαμαι πρὸς τῷ καλουμένῳ Ὀλύμπῳ ὄρει, σποράδην οἰκοῦντας, καὶ τοὺς αὐτόθι λόφους καὶ ὑπωρείας γεωργοῦντας.—Sozom. ix. 5.

And, also, that a chief with the Turk name *Aspar** (perhaps a *Turcilingian*) took part in their politics :—Ὅτι Σκίροι καὶ Γότθοι εἰς πόλεμον συνελθόντες καὶ διαχωρισθέντες ἀμφότεροι πρὸς συμμάχων μετάκλησιν παρεσκευάζοντο· ἐν οἷς καὶ παρὰ τοὺς ἑῴους ἦλθον. Καὶ Ἄσπαρ μὲν ἠγεῖτο μηδετέροις συμμαχεῖν, ὁ δὲ αὐτοκράτωρ Λέων ἐβούλετο Σκίροις ἐπικουρεῖν. Καὶ δὴ γράμμότα πρὸς τὸν ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς στρατηγὸν ἔπεμπεν, ἐντελλόμενός σφισιν κατὰ τῶν Γότθων βοήθειαν τὴν προσήκουσαν πέμπειν.—Prisci Rhet. Fragm. ed. Bonn. p. 160.

It is, then, not wholly improbable that the *Sciri* and *Turcilingi* may have been *Turks*; the first, perhaps, of that stock that penetrated far into Europe. *The Sciri*, after their misfortunes having been reduced in power, became subject to Gothic leaders, and, finally fixed, as a military colony, in Styria (*Steyer-mark*, or the *March of the Styri*).

The notion that *Hirri* = *Sciri* is confirmed by the form Σκίρροι in Procopius, Bell. Goth. i. 1 :—Σκίρρους καὶ Ἀλάνους καὶ ἄλλα ἄττα Γότθικα ἔθνῆ.

But how are we to account for the *Sciri* of Pliny, placed by that writer so far north as *Eningia*, probably *Fenningia* = the *Finn* country? We may suppose him to have lain under the same mistake with Tacitus in respect to the distance between the parts about the Gulf of Riga and the Lower Danube, and to have made it less than it really was. Hence, as Tacitus (Germ. § XLVI.) brings the *Peucini* and *Bastarnæ* too near the *Finni* and *Venedi*, Pliny does the same with the *Sciri*.

It may be added that, amongst the members of the *Hun* confederacy, no element, in words apparently compound, is more common than the combination of *r* and a compound sibilant (*sh*, *zh*, *tsh*, *dzh*); and (as a consequence of this) no termination is more common amongst Hun nations than that of *-zuri*, *-sciri*, &c.

That this compound sibilant is just the combination which is rendered sometimes by *sk*, and sometimes by *st*, as is suggested in not. ad v. *Narisci*.

Thus, amongst the names which no writer has ever made

* This is also an *Isaurian* name.

German, and but few have considered Slavonic, we have in the different Hun, Alan, Avar, and Bulgarian alliances the following—

1. Alpil-*zuri*, *al.* Ἀμίλ-ζουροι, &c.
2. Alci-*dzuri*, *al.* Ulcini-*zures*, Οὐλτί-ζουροι, &c.
3. Angi-*sciri*.
4. Ἀκάτ-ζιροι.

If we add to these the word ending in -*gurii*, the number is increased—Sata-*gurii*, Ono-*gurii*, &c.

§ XXXVI. THE ALANI.

It has been stated that the Alans were of the Turk stock; and as the Sciri have been placed in the same category with them, the Sciri being a people that has sometimes been considered German, the investigation of their ethnology finds place in the present work.

The two broad facts that bear upon this question are—

1. The area of the Alans is beyond that of either the Germans or the Sarmatians. This was the parts due north of Circassia, or the great irregular triangle formed by the Lower Don, the Lower Volga, and Caucasus.

2. The present occupants of this area are the Nogay Tartars of the Turk stock—occupants who cannot be shown to be of recent introduction.

3. Lucian (Toxaris, 51) makes them Scythians—*Ταῦτα δὲ ἔλεγεν ὁ Μακέντης, ὁμόσκευος καὶ ὁμόγλωττος τοῖς Ἀλανοῖς ὤν· κοινὰ γὰρ ταῦτα Ἀλανοῖς καὶ Σκύθαις, πλὴν ὅτι οὐ πάνυ κομῶσιν οἱ Ἀλανοὶ ὥσπερ οἱ Σκύθαι. Ἀλλὰ ὁ Μακέντης καὶ ταῦτα εἴκαστο αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπεκεκάρκει τῆς κόμης, ὁπόσον εἰκὸς ἦν ἔλαττον κομᾶν τὸν Ἀλανὸν τοῦ Σκύθου.*

This reduces the stocks that may fairly claim them to three.

1. They may have been the most northern branch of the Circassians.
2. The most southern of the Ugrians.
3. Turks.

The Turk character of the present population favours the third of these stocks.

So does the part the Alans played in history—greater than that of the Circassians, and the same in kind with that of the Turks. Besides which, no Circassian nation was likely to be called *Scythian*.

Minute ethnology gives us more facts in support of this affinity.

The Alans were what the Huns were—"Proceri autem Alani pæne sunt omnes et pulchri, crinibus mediocriter flavis: oculorum temperata torvitate terribiles et armorum levitate veloces, Hunnisque per omnia suppares, verum victu mitiores et cultu."—Ammianus, xxxi. 2.

This carries on the investigation to the consideration of the Huns.

§ XXXVII. THE HUNS.

The expressed opinion of Niebuhr is that the Huns were *Mongols*. This being the inference from the descriptions of their personal appearance alone, combined with the inaccurate notion that it is only in the true Mongols of Mongolia that the physiognomy of the Huns of Attila is to be found.*

Humboldt has expressed himself with equal confidence as to their being *Ugrian*, and this is, perhaps, the current notion. It chiefly rests upon the present occupants of *Hun*-gary belonging to that stock.

Zeuss, however, whose account of all such nations as no migrations and no etymologies can convert into German, is as unexceptionable as it is valuable, makes them Turks, and so, perhaps, do the majority of writers who have gone beyond their first impressions, and undertaken the investigation of a somewhat complex question.

The first step towards ensuring ourselves against being misled by the similarity of names *Hun* and *Hun*-gary is to remember that the names *Welshman* and *Greek* are not more foreign to the Cambro-Briton and the Hellene than is the name *Hun*-garian to the Majiar. The Slavonians of Moravia, Bohemia, Poland, Gallicia, Servia, Russia, and Croa-

* The extent to which the so-called Mongol physiognomy is common to the proper Mongolians, the Turks as well, is considered in the author's Varieties of the Human Species, pp. 77—79.

tia call him so, and we of England use the name thus applied. But that is all.

In his own eyes he is a *Majiar; Mogerius* as the few old Latin writers who adhere to the native appellation have it—Mogerius, or sometimes *Dentu*-Mogerius.

Yet, with all this, he is not a Hungarian exactly, as the Spaniard of the New World is a Mexican; and the reason why the Slavonians call him Hungarian is *not* because he settled in a country to which the name of Hungary had been previously given by the Huns of Attila. The proofs of this name being in use between the fifth and ninth centuries, are few and far between; nor yet are they absolutely conclusive.

The real reason why the Majiar bears in countries around him the same name with the subjects of the Scourge of God lies deeper. Just as the Germanic nations call not only the Cambro-Britons by the name *Welsh*, but the Italians also, the Russians of Eastern Europe called their most western Asiatic neighbours by the general name of *Ungri*—whether Turk or Finn: so that whether the one or whether the other wrested from Europe a part of the soil, the territory thus appropriated would equally be called Hungary.

This we learn from Nestor, who separates the Ugrian Majiars from the Turk Chazars, by calling the one *Black* the other *White* * Huns.

From the name *Hun* not being native, the investigation of the ethnological affinities of that nation becomes difficult; and this difficulty is increased by its being applied to two different classes of western Asiatics. It unfortunately happens, too, that whilst the rulers of the Avars, the Chazars, the Petchinegi and other tribes are frequently mentioned by the truly Turk term *Khan* (Χάγανος), that title is never given to Attila—who is either *rex* or *βασιλεύς*. On the other hand, however, Paulus Diaconus writes—"*Huni* qui et *Avares* dicuntur;" and Priscus speaks of the *Chazar Huns* (Ἀκάτιροις Οὔννοις), the Tartar affinities of the Chazars being beyond doubt, and the king of the Avars being often called Khan (Χάγανος).

* The forms of this word are, in the Old Slavonic *Ugri*, in Bohemian *Uhry*, in Polish *Wggri*, in Russian *Vengri*.

This is evidence of a more indirect kind than we expect in a nation like the Huns, but, provided that we clear our minds of all prepossessions arising from the name, it is, perhaps, sufficient.

§ XXXVIII. THE SZEKLERS, SICULI, OR SYSSELE (?).

The note of interrogation denotes that the identity of these three populations is open to the further investigation of scholars, and that the present writer hesitates about it.

Alfred mentions the *Syssele*—"Be norðan Eald-Seaxum is Apdrede, and east norð Vylte, þe man Æfeldan hæt, and be eastan him is Vineda land, þe man hæt *Syssyle*, and east suð ofer summe dæl Maroaro."

At the present moment a part of the Hungarians is called *Szekler*, pronounced *Sekler*. Now in the work known as that of the Notary of King Bela we have the following passage:—"*Siculi*, qui primo erant populi Attilæ regis."—Not. c. 50. And also "Tria millia virorum, eadem de natione (Hunorum). . . metuentes ad Erdewelwe confinia videlicet Pannonicæ regionis se transtulere, et non Hunos sive Hungaros, sed ne illorum agnoscerentur esse residui, *Siculos*, ipsorum autem vocabulo *Zekel*, se denominasse perhibentur. Hi Siculi Hunorum prima fronte in Pannoniam intrantium etiam hac nostra tempestate residui esse dubitantur per neminem, cum in ipsorum generatione, extraneo nondum permixta sanguine, et in moribus severiores et in divisione agri ceteris Hungaris multum differre videantur."—Thwrocz, ap. Schwandtn. p. 78.

In Majiar, in the same page of Zeuss, I find that *Szekely* (in the plural *Székelyek*)=*Marchman*.

Between the—

a. Late date of the authors, and—

b. The likelihood of the Majiars having taken the word *Zikel* from the *Siculi*, the following inference is exceptionable.

But it is—

That, even before the time of Alfred, *Ugrians*, of the same branch with the Majiars had found their way to the Danubian provinces—probably as part of the Hun forces.

The objection, notified in not. ad v. *Sarmatis* (p. 16), against the power of the word *Jasyk*, finds its place here. In Majiar *Jasag* = *bowman*. Now if we carry the existence of Majiars in Europe as far beyond the date of the *Siculi* (supposing them to be what is here suggested) as the *Siculi* are earlier than the undoubted Majiars, the name of the *Jazyges* may be not Slavonic but Majiar.

This would, certainly, throw a doubt over many important deductions. But, as the *Majiars* may have taken the name from the *Jazyges*, and having first called them *bowmen*, called others so also, I do not lay much stress on the fact. Besides which the word *Jazyk* would not cease to be Slavonic simply because it was Majiar also.

§ XXXIX. THE RUGII, HERULI, TURCILINGI AND SCIRI.

If we look back on the evidence of these tribes being Germanic, we shall find what we found with the Gepidæ—the evidence of their locality and the testimony of certain authors against them, that of their alliances and the names of their leaders in favour of them.

The Rugii have the best claim. They have a *name* in common with the *Rugii* of Tacitus; but this, even if liable to no exceptions, would only imply a migration—not, necessarily, a Germanic one. On the other hand, they are identified with the *Turcilingi*, whose claim to be considered Germans is the worst.

The Heruli have their relations to the *Aviones*; but this only implies that the *Aviones* moved southwards.

Upon the whole, I think that none were German—but am unable to distribute them among the Turk, Slavonic and (even) Ugrian stocks.

The populations which now follow, have their relations with *English* rather than *Roman* history.

§ XL. THE VARNI.

This is a difficult name, and I limit myself to the establishment of one proposition—*viz.: that it is not necessary to*

deduce the Varni of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, from the Varini of Tacitus; i.e., that no migration *from north to south, between the time of Domitian* (when Tacitus wrote) *and Augustulus* is required.

The phenomena may be accounted for otherwise.

The locality of these latter *Varni* is the Middle Danube. Their theatre is Italy, the Rhine, and Spain. The names of some of their leaders are German—*e.g.*, *Achi-ulf*:—"Theodericus præponens Suevis, quos subjecerat, clientem Achiulfum. Qui in brevi animum ad prævaricationem ex Suevorum suasionibus commutans neglexit imperata complere, potius tyrannica elatione superbiens, credensque se ea virtute provinciam obtinere, qua dudum cum domino suo eam subjecisset. Is siquidem erat *Warnorum* stirpe genitus, longe a Gothici sanguinis nobilitate sejunctus, idcirco nec libertati studens, nec patrono fidem servans."—Jorn. c. 44.

In Italy we have the notice of Agathias:—Ναρσῆς ἐς Ἀρίμηνον ἐχώρει τὴν πόλιν, ξὺν τοῖς ὁπόσοι αὐτῷ καὶ πρότερον εἵποντο. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ Οὐάκκαρος ὁ Οὔαρνος τὸ γένος ὀλίγῳ πρότερον ἐτεθνήκει, ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα δεινός τε καὶ φιλοπόλεμος, αὐτίκα ὁ παῖς ὁ ἐκείνου Θευδίβαλδος (τοῦτο γὰρ ὄνομα τῷ παιδὶ) ἅμα τοῖς ἑπομένοις Οὐάρνοις βασιλεῖ τῶν Ῥωμαίων προσεχώρει καὶ ἐς Ἀρίμηνον παρῆν, ὡς αὐτοῦ τῷ Ναρσῇ ἐντευξόμενος.—i. 24.

Now these *Varni* need, by no means, be the *Varini* of Tacitus; since Ptolemy mentions *Avareni* on the *Vistula*; so that they may as easily be the one as the other:—Αὐαρηνοὶ παρὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Οὐϊστούλα ποταμοῦ. Ὑφ' οὓς, Ὄμβρωνες. Εἶτα, Ἀναρτοφράκτοι. Εἶτα, Βουργίωνες. Εἶτα, Ἀρσιῆται. Εἶτα, Σαβόκοι. Εἶτα, Πιενγῖται, καὶ Βιέσσοι παρὰ τὸν Καρπάτην ὄρος. Another reading is Ἀβαρινοί; a migration which would bring these Αὐαρηνοί from the *Varini* must have been immediately subsequent to the time of Tacitus.

I believe, then, the *Varni* of the Danube to have been *Avareni*; and of the Avareni being new immigrants, there is no proof, and a presumption against it.

At any rate, the probability of a migration is decreased by the decrease of the time allowed for it.

The best evidence of their being *Germans* is that of the names of their leaders; but such evidence would make the Spaniards who fought under *Wellington*, Englishmen.

But what if we find *Varni* on the Rhine, a comparatively northern locality? The most that follows from this is a doubt as to which of the two nearly synonymous populations they were—*Avareni* of the Vistula, or *Varini* of the Lower Elbe.

What if we find them in connection with the *Angli?* This helps us in the decision, and inclines us to prefer the *Varini*; but it by no means proves connection.

But what if they be *Angles* in Thuringia? This, again, only makes us pause in deciding which *Angles* are meant. It never touches the connection.

What if we find them in contact with the Danes? This denotes that the particular *V-r-n-* thus described were *Varini*.

But what if *Dani*=*Daci?* * This throws us back on the *Avareni*.

Nothing, however, touches the connection. It is only the details that are complicated: details which are just as difficult, whether we suppose a migration or not.

All this really happens, as may be seen by comparing the following extract with the *Epilegomena*, §§ XLI. and XLII.:—*Οὔαρνοι μὲν ὑπὲρ Ἴστρον ποταμὸν ἵδρυνται, διήκουσι δὲ ἄχρι τε ἐς Ὠκεανὸν τὸν ἀρκτῷον καὶ ποταμὸν Ῥῆνον, ὅσπερ αὐτούς τε διορίζει καὶ Φράγγους καὶ τἆλλα ἔθνη, ἃ ταύτῃ ἵδρυνται. Οὗτοι ἅπαντες, ὅσοι τὸ παλαιὸν ἀμφὶ Ῥῆνον ἑκατέρωθεν ποταμὸν ᾤκηντο, ἰδίου μέν τινος ὀνόματος ἕκαστοι μετελάγχανον . . . ἐπὶ κοινῆς δε Γερμανοὶ ἐκαλοῦντο ἅπαντες . . Οὔαρνοι δὲ καὶ Φράγγοι τουτὶ μόνον τοῦ Ῥήνου τὸ ὕδωρ μεταξὺ ἔχουσιν.*—Procop. Bell. Goth. iv. 20.

Again, *Ἔρουλοι . . ἔρημον δὲ χώραν διαβάντες ἐνθένδε πολλὴν ἐς τοὺς Οὐάρνους καλουμένους ἐχώρησαν. Μεθ' οὓς δὴ καὶ Δανῶν τὰ ἔθνη παρέδραμον.*—Procop. Bell. Goth. ii. 15.

Lastly, Procopius relates that an *Angle* princess was betrothed to Radiger, the prince of the *Varni*.—The Saxons in England, i. 23.

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Dani*.

§ XLI. ON THE ANGLI OF THURINGIA.

The heading of a body of laws of, perhaps, the tenth century, is, *Incipit Lex Anglorum et Werinorum, hoc est Thuringorum.*

Zeuss mentions *Englide* or *Engilin* as a Thuringian *Gau*=*pagus.*

§ XLII. ON THE WERINI OF THURINGIA.

This must be read along with §§ XL. and XLI.

The *Werra* was a river of Thuringia, which it divided from Saxony.

a. Unless we suppose either that the river *Warnow* effected a migration—

b. Or that it took its name from the *Varini*, who did so—

c. Or that there was a colonial settlement—

We must suppose that the population took its name from the river, that *Werini* meant the people of the *Werra*, and that the two populations were as unconnected as the two rivers.

But the names of different rivers being so like, as *Werra* is to *Warnow*, is against the chances.

And the two *Angle* localities are so as well.

And the contiguity of the Angles of the Elbe to the Varini, taken with that of the Angles of Thuringia to the Werini, is still more so.

Still the names of the rivers are facts which we must take as we find; since the circumstance of a river taking its name from its occupants is as rare as the converse is common, especially amongst the Slavonic populations.

Even if we assume a colonization like that of the *Chamavi* and *Chattuarii*, the difficulty is only diminished; since it would still be strange that the people of the *War-now* should be removed to a locality with a name so near their own as the *Werra.*

Werra may possibly, like *Oose* and *Avon*, have been a name that, from being a *common* rather than a *proper* one, recurs in different places.

Still, the difficulty of the relation of the *Angli* and *Werini*

of Thuringia on one side, and that of the *Angli* and *Varini* of Mecklenburg on the other, remains.

I am inclined to believe in a colonization; at any rate, I am disinclined to lay so much stress on the heading in question, as to allow it to disturb—as I once* did—the general and admitted ethnological differences between the *Saxon* Angles and the *High-German* Thuringians.

Still, to explain the similarity of name, conjoined with the geographical contact of the *Angles*, by the assumption of a colony, by no means explains the nearly contemporaneous existence of *Varini* and *Varni*.

The doctrine of the rivers, however, does; the reasoning running thus—

There was more than one Slavonic river *W-r*; and—

More than one Slavonic population that took its name from such rivers.

Still, this is but hypothesis.

§ XLIII. THE YMBRE.

This name occurs in the Traveller's Song.

It has been supposed to mean the people of the isle *Amróm* of Sleswick.

Also, the *Ambrones* of the Cimbro-Teutonic invasion.

I think it means one of three things.

1. *Humbrians*, or people of the *Ymbra-land*, a name not improbably applied to the East Riding of Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire, although at present we have only the compound North-*humber*-land (North-*hymbra*-land) in an undoubted and unexceptionable form. On the other hand, the British king, Uther Pendragon, is made to say, "Vocabant me semimortuum *Ambrones* isti, sed malo semimortuus eos superasse quam incolumis superari."—Sigebert, Gemblacensis, ad an. 466. Nennius places the *Ambrones* near the Picts.

2. Certain *Old* Saxons:—"Paulinus Eboracensis Archiepiscopus eos baptizavit et per XL. dies non cessavit baptizare omne genus *Ambronum*, id est, *Ald*saxonum."—Nennius, ap. Gale, i. 119.

* In my work on the English Language.

3. The occupants of the district of *Amer*-land in Oldenburg.

It is not impossible that the first two *Ambrones* may be the same people, *i.e.*, *both* Saxons of Britain, rather than British Saxons, in the first case, and German Saxons (as the true Old Saxons were) in the second; since there is some difficulty in believing an archbishop of York to have been employed so far from his diocese as Westphalia, and a Welsh monk recording his operations.—Since

a. There may have been certain *Old* Saxons in Britain; just as there were certain Frisians.

b. *Old* Saxon might, to a Briton like Nennius, have been equivalent to *pagan* Saxon; since one of the first duties of the Christianized Anglo-Saxons of England was to convert the *Old* Saxons of the Continent, as is narrated fully by Beda. Hence, the distinction between Pagan and Christian nearly coincided with that between English and Westphalian—insular and continental—*Old* and *Angle*.

A reason for the Britons being ready to apply such a name as *Ambrones* to their invaders, is well supplied by Zeuss (p. 151). Some of the Keltic neighbours of the Ambrones, conquered by Marius, called robbers *Ambrones*—"Ambrones prædationibus se suosque alere cœperunt . . ex quo tractum est, ut *turpis vitæ homines Ambrones* dicerentur." —Festus.

The *Ligurians* called themselves so—*Σφᾶς γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὕτως ὀνομάζουσι κατὰ γένος Λίγυες*.—Plut. vit. Mar.

This makes it look as if the Ligurian *Ambrones* were such formidable robbers as to have made their name synonymous with *plunderer*—for, it must be observed that Plutarch says that they called themselves what Festus says their neighbours called them, *men of a bad life*.

The word *Ymbre* has thus been enlarged upon, because it has been put forth as an element in the doctrine of the German origin of the Cimbri and Teutones; to which has been appended the more especial doctrine that these Ligurian Ambrones were part and parcel of the so-called Germans of the Pennine Alps.—See § i. note 3.

What the *Ymbre* were is uncertain. The Ambrones were

simply Ligurians; and, as such, probably Keltic. This, however, is no part of German ethnology.

What follows is a mere suggestion. It has arisen from the extent to which the pluri-presence of populations with names in *-mbr-* would be explained by the hypothesis that that combination was, like the word *Marcomanni*, expressive of some physical or political relation: in which case there might be as many nations named *Ambr*-ones, *Umbr*-i, *Cumbr*-i, *Gambr*-ivii, Si-*cambr*-i, &c., as there were instances of such a relationship occurring. In this case, of course, all the names must be referable to one language. This is no difficulty. Such a language is the *Keltic.*

Now all the nations thus named occupy the lower part of some river, *i.e.*, its *Humber.*

1. The Ambrones seem to have been on the Lower Rhone.
2. The Umbri on the Lower Po.
3. The Cumbrians of Cumberland on the Solway.
4. The Gambrivii and *Si*-cambri * on the Lower Rhine.

Assume, then, *Humber* to be the Gallic and East-British form of the Welsh *Aber*, and the Gaelic *Inver=mouth of a river*, and all these facts are connected.

Still, the doctrine is but a suggestion, and its application to the details of the *Cimbri* and *Kymry* has yet to be made.

One fact, however, deserves notice. Both the Cimbri and Ambrones are said to have been driven from their own country by *inundations.*

Of the Ambrones Festus (*loco citato*) writes—"Ambrones fuerunt quædam gens *Gallica* qui, subita inundatione maris, cum amisissent sedes suas rapinis et prædationibus se suosque alere cœperunt."

§ XLIV. THE TEUTONES AND TEUTONARII.

Mela places *Teutoni* on the Baltic. So does Pliny. It was *Teutones* to whom the amber-gatherers sold their amber. It has been supposed, however, that the text would be improved by reading *Guttones* — unnecessarily. Ptolemy

* Qy. South-Humbrians.

mentions both *Teutones* and *Teuton-arii* (Teutono-*ware*) with the *Viruni* between the *Saxons* and *Suevi.*

This places them in the parts about the Elbe.

Ptolemy's names, I imagine, are, like the *Chatti* of *Essen* and *Chatt-uarii*, names of one and the same people.

Hence, it seems safe to assert—that there were *Teutons* on the Lower Elbe, near enough to the Germans to have a German compound, as their name—*Teuton-arii* = *Teutono-ware.*

Whether they were Germans is another question. They may have been Germans of the Germano-Slavonic March in Luneburg, or Mecklenburg.

In the history of ethnological opinion these *Teutones* have a prominent place. They cannot but have been identified with the Teutones of the Cimbro-Teutonic war—with migrations to match.

Yet the chief reason which makes the Teutones of Marius look like Germans is the fact that most militates against our identifying them with the Teutones of Ptolemy.

Diot=*people*; so that it is a *common* rather than a *proper* name; and, as such, a name which may be applied to any population which chooses to call itself *people*, *men*, or *nation.*

Now nations may do this independently of ethnological affinity.

But this is overlooked; and it is overlooked because the impossibility of *Deut-sch* = *Teut-on*, has never been thoroughly acted upon.

The root *L-t*=*people* in German (*Leute*); yet no one argues that the *Lat-ins*, *Lith-uanians*, and a host of other populations must, for that reason, be German.

The root *V-lg*=*people* in Latin (*vulg-us*), yet no one gives this as a reason for making the *Belg-æ* Romans.

F-lk, too, does the same in *German.* But is this a reason for snapping-up every nation whose name is *Volc-æ*, *Belg-æ*, or something like it, as German? If so, the *Volcæ* Tectosages would be Germans.

Why, then, apply a rule to the root *T-t*=*people* which we apply to no other combination of sounds with a similar power? Because, the impossibility alluded to has never been truly realized in the mind of the inquirer, and men argue about

the root of the word *Deut-sch* as they would not argue about any other root with a like meaning.

Besides which the proof of *Teut-*, in *Teut*-ones and *Teut-onarii*, being German at all is deficient. It may be as little German as the *Cant-*, in *Cant-ware*.

§ XLV. THE JUTES.

That *Jutes* gave the name to *Jut*-land is certain: but that they were *Danes* who did so, as the *Angles* did in the case of *England*, is doubtful.

They more probably gave a name to an area from which certain subsequent Danish invaders took theirs—just as the Keltic people of *Cantium* did to *Kent*, the country of the Saxon *Cantwære* and *Kentings*.

The particular question as to whether the Jutes of Jutland took part in the Anglo-Saxon invasion of England, has already been indicated, and the question is more fully investigated in another work of the author's,* the answer being in the negative.

§ XLVI. THE NORDALBINGIANS.

This is the general name for the *Saxons north of the Elbe* in the eighth century.

An anonymous versifier (ad an. 798) writes:—

> "Saxonum populus quidam, quos claudit ab austro
> Albia sejunctim positos aquilonis ad axem.
> Hos Northalbingos patrio sermone vocamus."

The details we get from Adam of Bremen:—"Transalbianorum Saxonum tres sunt populi: primi ad Oceanum *Thiatmarsgoi* (al. *Thiedmarsi*), et eorum ecclesia Mildinthorp (al. Melindorp); secundi *Holtzati*, dicti a silvis, quas incolunt, eos Sturia flumen interfluit, quorum ecclesia Sconenfeld; tertii, qui et nobiliores, *Sturmarii* dicuntur, eo quod seditionibus illa gens frequenter agitur. Inter quos metropolis Hammaburg caput extollit."—Adam Brem. Hist. Eccl. c. 61. "Habet utique Hammenburgensis ecclesia præscriptos terminos

* English Language, third edition,

suæ parochiæ, ultimam scilicet partem Saxoniæ, quæ est trans Albiam et dicitur Nordalbingia, continens tres populos, *Tethmarsos*, *Holsatos*, *Stormarios*."—Helmold. Chron. Slavor. i. 6. "Attritæ sunt vires Saxonum, et servierunt Cruconi sub tributo, omnis terra videlicet Nordalbingorum, quæ disterminatur in tres populos: *Holzatos*, *Sturmarios*, *Thetmarchos*."—Id. i. 26.

This means the *Germans* of Holstein, Stormar, and Ditmarsh; but whether they were *Saxons*, strictly speaking, is uncertain.

The *present* population is Platt-Deutsch; but the introduction of this is subsequent to the ninth century.

The population on which it encroached was *North Frisian*; and this, I believe, to have been what was called the *Nordalbingian Saxon*.—See note in v. *Frisii*.

§ XLVII. THE JUTHUNGI.

I believe this to be a German modification of the Tshekh (Bohemian or Moravian) name of the *Gothini*; the *Tshekh* modification having changed the *G* to *J*, and the *German* the *t* to *th*. Besides which, it replaced the inflectional element *-n-* by the affix *-ung*; as was the case in the word *Po-lab-ing-as* = Slavonians of the Elbe (*Laba*); where *po-* is Slavonic, *Laba*, Slavonic, and *-ing-* German.

The form *Vitungi* occurs=*Juthungi*. Now these and similar varieties* should remove all difficulties on the score of a word taking such different shapes as *Jutæ*, *Juthungi*, *Geatas*, *Gothi*, *Gothini*, *Gythones*, *Guttones*, *Gautæ*, *Vitæ*, *Vithungi*, *Getæ*; since the following varieties of an equally simple root are as numerous. The Bulgarians appear as *Bulg*, *Burg*, *Borg*, *Burug*, *Wurug*, *Wurg*, *Vulg*, *Bular*, *Byler*, *Bilers*, *Biler*, *Beire*. Similar instances could be multiplied; but this is one where the languages through which the form passes are the same, *i.e.*, Slavonic, German, Latin, and Greek.

These varieties of form not only cause no difficulty, but they supply a confirmation. The unsteadiness of power in the case of the consonant G, is what is expected *a priori*,

* We find *Vitæ*=*Jutæ*.

from the sound-system of the different Slavonic languages. Thus, the sounds akin to the *g* in *gun*, and the *k* in *kind*, are not equally distributed over the Bohemian, the Polish, the Russian, and the Lithuanic. No Slavonic tongue has the four sounds of *g*, *k*, *kh*, and *h*. Each has two or three of them. Thus—

Bohemian	k	-	kh	h	*with*	*g* wanting.
Lusatian	k	-	kh	h	,,	*g* wanting.
Russian	k	g	kh	-	,,	*h* wanting.
Polish	k	g	kh	-	,,	*h* wanting.
Bulgarian	k	g	kh	-	,,	*h* wanting.
Illyrian	k	g	-	-	,,	*kh* and *h* wanting.
Lithuanic	k	g	-	-	,,	*kh* and *h* wanting.
**Lettish*	k	g	-	-	,,	*kh* and *h* wanting.

Hence, where the Poles say *g*, the Bohemians say *h*; whereas the Russian spells such foreign words as *Herold* and *Hertzog*, *Gerold* and *Gercog*; there being no sign for *h*. So that if a Bohemian and Lusatian wished to pronounce such a name as *Got*, as a Pole pronounced it, he would fail in doing so, and say *Hot* instead; and *vice versâ*, a Lett would change *Hot* into *Got*.

I admit that these facts require the initial in the words *Jutæ*, and *Juthung*, to be *H* rather than *J*.† On the other hand, I think that, as H is the modern form, *J* may have been the older one; in other words, that the change from *g* to *h* may not have been direct and immediate, but as follows:—*g*, *j* (*y*), *h*.

I submit that these remarks are sufficient reasons for the existence of *some* difference at least in the forms of the names in question, if not for the exact differences which we actually find. Thus much concerning the change from *g* to *j* (*y*).

The one from *j* to *v* can, in like manner, be shown to be no arbitrary assumption, but a true and proper letter-change of the Slavonic-Lithuanic languages.

* From a valuable work on the Lithuanic language, showing its Slavonic character, by G. L. Daae; Christiania.

† Pronounced *Y*.

§ XLVIII. THE SAXONS.

The hypothesis respecting the Saxons is as follows:—

The name *Saxon* was to the *Kelts* of Britain, what *German* was to those of Gaul.

Or, if not, what *Suevi* was—a name somewhat more specific.

It probably applied to the Germans of the sea-coast, and the water-systems of the Lower Rhine, Weser, Lower Elbe, and Eyder; to Low Germans on the Rhine, to Frisians and Saxons on the Elbe, and to North Frisians on the Eyder.

All the Angles were Saxons, but all the Saxons were not Angles.

The reasoning in favour of this view is as follows:—

That *Saxon* was a Britannic term is undenied. The Welsh and Gaels call us *Saxons* at the present moment.

The Romans would take their name for certain Germans, as they found it with the Britons.

The Britons and Romans using the same name, would be as two to one in favour of the Keltic name taking ground. It would be the Roman and Keltic against a German name single-handed.

The only question is, whether the name *Saxon* was *exclusively* Britannic (Keltic), *i.e.*, not German also.

In favour of the word being German, are two facts—

1. The thorough adoption of the root *Saxon*, as denoted not only by the use of German writers, but by its appearance in *Es-sex*, *Wes-sex*, *Sus-sex*, *Middle-sex*. The reasoning that applies to *Suevi*, applies here.

2. The name *Sax*-neot, as a deity, whom the Old Saxons, on their conversion to Christianity, were compelled to forswear. This gives us the likelihood of its being the name of an *eponymus*. I admit that this is *cogent*, but not that it is conclusive.

3. The story about *nimeþ eowre Saxas* = *take your daggers*, and the deduction from it, that *Saxons* meant *dagger-men*, is of no great weight; with the present writer at least. Still, as far as it goes, it is something.

4. The Finlanders call the Germans *Saxon*. This is weighty.

On the other hand—

1. No clear distinction has ever been drawn between, *e.g.*, an Angle of Suffolk and a *Saxon* of *Essex*.

2. The Romans, who knew, for some parts at least, every inch of the land occupied by the Saxons of Germany, as long as there is reason for believing that they took their names from German sources, never use the word *Saxon* at all. It is strange to Cæsar, Strabo, Pliny, and Tacitus. (See note in v. *Cherusci*). Ptolemy is the first who uses it.

3. A native name by which the West-Saxons of *Wessex* called themselves, was *Gewissas*. This is well accounted for by supposing it to be a British name in a German mouth.

4. Whenever we find a population called *Saxon*, we find that, for some reason or other, it has some other name as well. Thus the so-called—

a. Saxons of Holstein, are *Nordalbingians* when the name is general; *Ditmarsi*, *Holsati*, and *Stormarii* when we have them in detail.

b. Those of Northern Germany are *West-phali*, *Ost-phali*, and *Angarii*.

5. Of all such synonyms, *Saxon* is the least German in respect to its form; a fact which precludes us from admitting the existence of a second language, but denying its application to the word *Saxon*. Thus, admitting that the words belong to different languages, it cannot be said that of the two—

a. *Saxon* as opposed to *Angle* is *Germanic*, and *Angle* as opposed to *Saxon* is *non*-Germanic.

b. Nor yet can it be said of the most doubtful synonym of the list, *Cheru-sci*; since the *-sc*, whether German or not, is more German than anything in the form Saxon.

c. With such words as *Nord*-albingii, *West*-phali, and Ang-*arii* (=*varii*), there is no doubt.

6. Whatever were the relations between the Angles and Saxons, populations *differently* related were called Saxons. Thus, the conquerors of the Slavonic country at present called Saxony, the ancestors of the Saxons of Dresden and

Leipsic, were by no means Saxons as the people of Sussex were. They were not even Saxons as the speakers of the language of the Heliand, the *Old* Saxons, were. They were either Platt-Deutsch, or High-German Germans; most probably a mixture of both. Yet they were called Saxons, because they conquered the *Saxony* of the nineteenth century, from a country which was called *Saxony* in the seventh and eighth, but which, probably, was not so called in the fourth and fifth, and which, certainly, was not so called in the second and third.

7. Procopius mentions only three populations in Britain—Angles, Frisians, and Britons.

8. The king who is said to have determined that England should be called the *Angle*-land, was a king of the West-Saxons, Ecbert.

I consider this a difficulty on one side fully equivalent to all on the other. It is as if the king of Prussia should propose that all Germany should call itself *Austria*.

I think, upon the whole, that *Saxon* was a word like *Greek*, *i.e.*, a term which, in the language of the *Hellenes*, was so very special, partial, and unimportant, as to have been practically a foreign term, or, at least, anything but a native name; whilst in that of the *Romans*, it was one of general and widely-extended import. Hence, *mutatis mutandis*, it is the insignificant *Saxones* of the neck of the Cimbric Chersonese, and the three Saxon islands, first mentioned by Ptolemy, who are the analogues of the equally unimportant *Græci* of Epirus; and these it was whose name eventually comprised populations as different as the Angles, and the Saxons of Saxony, even as the name *Græcus* in the mouth of a Roman comprised Dorians, Æolians, Macedonians, Athenians, Rhodians, &c.

In this way the name was *German*, but its extended import was *Keltic* and *Roman*. With this view, there is as little need to consider the Saxons of the neck of the Cimbric Chersonese to have been *exactly* what the *Angles* were, as there is for considering the *Græci* of Greece to have been exactly what the Athenians were. They might easily have belonged to another section of the Gothic population.

Such was, probably, the case. If not, the continuity

between the Frisians of Sleswick and the Frisians of Hanover is interrupted; a fact possible enough, but still a fact requiring the assumption of movements and displacements of which history supplies no record.

This will be further considered in the next section.

§ XLIX. THE ANGLI.

The preliminaries and complements to this § are the §§ on the *Saxons*, the *Jutes*, &c., the *Nordalbingi*, the *Werini* and *Angles* of *Thuringia*, and the notes on § XL.

Important as are the *Angles*, it is not too much to say that they are only known through their relations to us of *England*, their descendants; indeed, without this paramount fact, they would be liable to be confused with the Frisians, with the Old Saxons, with even the Slavonians.

This is chiefly because there is no satisfactory trace or fragment of the Angles of Germany within Germany; whilst the notices of the other writers of antiquity tell us as little as the one we find in Tacitus.

And this notice is not only brief but complicated.

The Eudoses, Nuithones, Aviones, Suardones, and Reudigni received what little light falls upon them from the single circumstance of their being mentioned along with the Angli. They *give* none.

The Varini, of whom the separate substantive and independent information is greater, complicate the question, by being a population for whom a Slavonic affinity may fairly be supposed.

The complications engendered by the term *Saxo* have already been noticed.

Surely, then, it is not too much to say that if it were not for the settlement in England, the Angli would have been as great a mystery to us as the Chali, the Eudoses, the Phundusii, or even the Hellusii and Oxiones. We know them from their *relations* only; and if it were not for these, involving, as they do, the English and Anglo-Saxon languages and literatures, the neighbours of the Varini and Reudigni, and the

worshippers of *Terra Mater*, would have passed for outlying Frisians, outlying Chauci, or outlying Cherusci; for anything rather than the representatives of a separate substantive branch of the great Saxon, or Frisian, or Saxo-Frisian division of the Germanic tongue.

This the *Angli* represent; but how far they do so single-handed, or how far the *Eudoses* and other populations of § XL. do the same, is uncertain.

I think they do not do so exactly.

1. To begin with the *Varini*, whose relations to the *Angli*, as already has been indicated, are eminently difficult—

The mention of them along with the *Angli*, is a presumption that they were what the *Angles* were.

Their common worship of the goddess *Hertha* is a specific fact; and if it were a fact beyond doubt, there would be no fair reasons for refining on the natural inference from the text of Tacitus; in other words, although there would still be a balance of conflicting difficulties, the evidence of a German object of worship, with a German name, in a German island, would outweigh the presumption arising from the *Warnavi* of authentic history being unequivocally Slavonic.

But the fact is not beyond impeachment; since we can find the elements of a natural and excusable error in the peculiar character of the *cultus* of the Angli on one side, and the *Varini* on the other.

What if the *Varini* had one *holy island*, and the *Angli* another—so that the *insulæ sacræ*, with their corresponding *casta nemora*, were *two* in number. I submit that a writer, with no better means of knowing the exact truth than Tacitus, might, in such a case, when he recognized the *insular* character common to the two forms of *cultus*, easily and pardonably, refer them to one and the same island: in other words, he might know the general fact that the *Angli* and *Varini* worshipped in an island, without knowing the particular fact of their each having a separate one.

This is what really happened: so that the hypothesis is as follows:—

a. The truly and undoubtedly Germanic *Angli* worshipped in Heligoland.

b. The probably Slavonic Varini worshipped in the Isle of Rugen.

c. The *holy island* of Tacitus is that of the Angli—

d. With whom the *Varini* are inaccurately associated—

e. The source of the inaccuracy lying in the fact of that nation having a *holy island*, different from that of the Angles, but not known to be so.

Now the passages that prove the *Varini* to have frequented the Isle of Rugen, prove something more. They prove their paganism. They prove, also, that some part of them were occupants of an island:—"Est autem insula quædam, non longe a civitate illa, habens mare interjectum, quasi itinere unius diei, *Verania* nomine."—"Intellexit ergo vir Dei, *Veranos* evangelicæ gratiæ indignos."—"Erant autem trans mare barbari crudelitate et sævitia singulares, qui *Verani* dicebantur."—Vit. Otton. Episcopi Boll. Jul., pp. 412, 413, 444.

Further still—and this bears on the ethnology of the *Rugii*—although it has been shown (*Prolegomena*, p. xix.) that the *-g-*, in the name of the Isle of *Rugen*, appears as early as the use of the word *Rugiani* in Helmoldus, the equivalent forms *Rani* and *Runi* (without the *g*) must be remarked. Now this omission of the *-g-* is exemplified by a vast variety of other forms, *e.g.*, *Ruani*, *Roani*, *Rujani*, *Ruia*, *Ruja*, *Roja*, *Ruiana*, and others, to be found in Zeuss (p. 665).

What is the effect of this? It subtracts from the likelihood of the *Rugii* of Tacitus being the *Rugiani* of the Isle of *Rugen*, and, *pro tanto*, favours the inference drawn from their juxtaposition to the *Lemovii*, or the notion that they are the populations of the Gulf of *Riga*.—See nott. in vv. *Rugii* and *Lemovii*.

The *Varini*, then, are not to be considered *Angle*.

2. The *Aviones*, whether *Obii* or *Chaviones* (see *Epilegomena*, § *Obii*), are a population of which we know nothing that helps the present question. If identical with the nation bearing a similar name, further south, they must have effected a migration. Upon the principle of not making this longer than is needful, we must place them *south* of the Angli, rather than *north*. Now this southern locality, thus assumed, is a

reason against the Aviones having been Frisians, but no reason against their having been *Old* Saxons.

But against this is Ptolemy's name Κοϐανδοί, and the Κοϐανδοί lie northwards.

3. Whether the *Eudoses* are the same as the Φουνδούσιοι (see not. in § XL.) is not a matter of indifference. By identifying them, we ascertain the direction, if not the exact locality of the *Eudoses*. This is *northwards*, in the western part of the Cimbric Peninsula.

4. Whether the *Suardones* are the same as the Φαρόδεινοι (see not. in § XL.) is still less a matter of indifference. By identifying them we ascertain the direction, if not the exact locality, of the *Suardones*. This is *westwards* between the *Suebus* and the *Chalusus* (*Oder ?* and Trave ?). But then we get a complication; since *Suard-* is generally considered to be a German root, whereas the locality is Slavonian.

That *S-rd* is really a German root is rendered probable by the form *Sweord-were* in the Traveller's Song. But this only makes it a German gloss. That it applied to a German population by no means follows. No word is more German than Welsh, few populations less so.

5. In the name *Reudingi*, the *Reud-* may, possibly, be the *Hreð-*, in *Hreð*-Gotans. Now the *Hret-Gotan* were Lithuanians.

6. On the Nuithones I can throw no light at all,—not even in the way of guess-work and suggestion.

If we leave Tacitus and betake ourselves to Ptolemy, we gain a little. In Ptolemy we not only get the names of certain populations, but we get their locality (or at least their direction) also. But they are almost all new, and otherwise unknown, *Sigulones*, *Sabilingii*, *Chali*.

Upon the whole, I think that the Angli of Tacitus were the only representatives, enumerated by him, of the *Anglo*-Saxon branch of the Saxons,—unless the Nuithones be a second.

Of the others, I think that:—

a. Where their direction was easterly, they were *Slavonians*.

b. Where it was northerly, *Frisians*, or *Slavonians*,—Frisians in the north-*west*, Slavonians in the north-*east*.

Who, however, lay to the east, and who to the north, is a difficult question; and still more difficult is it to say who amongst the northern group, were on the east, and who on the west.

The *Sigulones* of Ptolemy are the most decidedly north-western, or Frisian; the *Varini* of Tacitus, the most decidedly eastern, or Slavonic. And this is as much as it is safe to say.

It is more important to consider the reasons for believing the populations to the north-west of the *Angli* to have been *Frisian*, rather than Angle, Saxon, or Anglo-Saxon. Why, in the face of the fact of the Nordalbingians (or the populations *north of the Elbe*) being called Saxons,* in the ninth century, suppose them to have been Frisians in the second?

The answer to this is sketched in the preceding §.

If Angle populations were the earliest occupants of western Holstein, when and how did the Frisians displace them?

If Frisians were the earliest, when did the Angles do so?

Now it must be admitted that there is some evidence in favour of this latter alternative; but evidence which is by no means conclusive.

Alfred writes (Orosius, p. 25), respecting Other, that "He seglode to þæm porte þe man hæt Hæðum. Se stent betwuh Winedum and Seaxum and *Angle* and hyrð in on Dene...and þa tvegen dagas ær he to Hæðum come, him wæs on þæt steorbord Gotland and Sillende and iglanda fela, *on þæm landum eardodon Engle; ær hi hider on land comon.*"

He also writes, "Comon hi (*i.e.*, the English) of þrim folcum þam strangestan Germaniæ, ðæt of *Seaxum*, and of *Angle*, and of *Geatum*. Of *Geata* fruman sindon *Cantware*, and *Wihtsætan*. Ðæt is seo þeod se Wiht þæt ealond on eardað. Of *Seaxum*, þæt is of þam lande þe man hateð Eald Seaxan, comon *East-seaxan*, and *Suð-seaxan*, and West-seaxan. And of *Engle* comon *Eastengle* and *Middelengle*, and *Myrce*, and eall *Norðhembra* cynn. Is þæt land þe Angulus is nemned betwyh Geatum and Seaxum. Is sæd of þære tide þe hi thanon gewitan oð to dæge þæt hit weste wunige."

And this statement re-appears in the Anglo-Saxon Chro-

* See *Epilegomena*, § *Nordalbingii.*

nicle, "Ða comon þa menn of þrim mægðum Germaniæ, of *Eald-Seaxum*, of *Anglum*, of *Iotum*. Of *Iotum* comon *Cantvare*, and *Wihtvare* (þæt is seo mæið þe nu eardað on Wiht), and þæt cynn on Westsexum þe man nu gyt het *Iutnacynn*. Of *Eald-Seaxum* comon *East-Seaxan* and *Suð-Seaxan*, and *West-Seaxan*. Of *Angle* comon, se a siððan stod westig betwix Iutum and Seaxum, *East-Engle*, and *Middel-Angle*, and *Mearce*, and ealle *Norðymbra*."

Ethelweard also says that, "*Anglia* vetus sita est inter Saxones et Giotos, habens oppidum capitale, quod sermone Saxonico Sleswic nuncupatur, secundum vero Danos Haithaby."

So does William of Malmesbury, "In oppido quod tunc Slaswich, nunc vero Eitheisi (al. Hurtheby) appellatur; est autem regio illa *Anglia vetus dicta, unde Angli venerunt in Britanniam*, inter Saxones et Giothos constituta."

All these statements are referable to one of Beda's, "Advenerant autem de tribus Germaniæ populis fortioribus, id est *Saxonibus*, *Anglis*, *Jutis*. De *Jutarum* origine sunt *Cantuarii* et *Vectuarii*, hoc est ea gens, quæ Vectam tenet insulam, et ea quæ usque hodie in provincia Occidentalium Saxonum *Jutarum* natio nominatur, posita contra ipsam insulam Vectam. De *Saxonibus*, id est ea regione, quæ nunc antiquorum Saxonum cognominatur, venere *Orientales Saxones*, *Meridiani Saxones*, *Occidui Saxones*. Porro de *Anglis*, hoc est de illa patria, quæ Angulus dicitur et ab eo tempore usque hodie manere desertus inter provincias Jutarum et Saxonum perhibetur, *Orientales Angli*, *Mediterranei Angli*, *Mercii*, tota *Nordhumbrorum* progenies, id est illarum gentium, quæ ad boream Humbri fluminis inhabitant, ceterique Anglorum populi sunt orti."—Beda, Hist. Ecclesiast. i. 15.

This shows that the English of the eighth century, at least, looked on Sleswick as their original country.

To which it must be added that there is at the present moment a district called *Anglen*, a part of the duchy of Sleswick, which is literally an *angle*; *i.e.*, a triangle of irregular shape, formed by the Schlie, the Flensborger Fiord, and a line drawn from Flensborg to Sleswick. Every geographical name in it is, however, Danish, whatever it may have been previously. Thus some villages end in *by* (Danish = *town*)

as Hus-*by*, Herreds-*by*, Ulse-*by*, &c.; some in *gaard* (=*house*), as *Oegaard*; whilst the other Danish forms are *skov* = *wood* (*shaw*), *hofved* = *head*, *lund* = *grove*, &c. In short, it has nothing to distinguish it from the other parts of the peninsula.

At one time I was inclined wholly to disconnect the name *Anglen* with the *Angles*; holding that it meant the *Angle* (*or nook*) *of land*, and was, simply, a geographical term misunderstood. Since then, however, I have been in the country, and found that there is a *second Angle district* to the south of Leck, and in the Frisian country; a fact which invalidates the previous view.

But, even if this be granted, it is only evidence to the fact of there being Angles in Sleswick *at the time of Beda*; and then they are in the Slavonic part of the island, on the Baltic side of it, and in an area no larger than the county of Rutland.

I still think that the Angli of Tacitus were—

1. The Angles of England—

2. Occupants of the northern parts of Hanover—

3. At least in the time of Tacitus—

4. And that to the exclusion of any territory in Holstein, which was Frisian to the west, and Slavonic to the east.

Still the question is one of great magnitude and numerous complications, involving, amongst other difficulties, the import of the term *Saxon*, and the accuracy of Beda's sources of information.

That the Saxons, however, of England, came from three small islands, and a fraction of Holstein, and the Angles from a few thousand acres on the wrong side of the peninsula, is a doctrine beset with objections, and intrinsically improbable.

§ L. THE DANES.

The area of the ancestors of the present Danes of Denmark was only part of the present kingdom, *i.e.*, the *islands*, not the peninsula of Jutland.

Even for these islands *Dan-* formed no part of the original

name. That was a compound of the familiar root, *Vit*-, viz., *Vithes-læth*:—"Dan filius Humblæ, de Svecia veniens, regnavit super Sialandiam, Monen, Falster et Laland, cujus regnum dicebatur *Withesleth*."—Chron. Erici reg. ap. Langeb. i. 150. "Dan pugil strenuissimus et magnis operibus præclarus, per electionem totius populi constitutus et intitulatus est rex *primo* super Sialandiam, Monam, Falstriam et Lalandiam, cujus regnum dicebatur *Vitheslæth*. Deinde super alias provincias et insulas et totum regnum."—Petr. Olai Chron. Reg. Dan. ap. Langeb. i. 77. "Ex ipso loco et *multis aliis Cronicis Danorum* colligitur, non esse verum, quod Jutia est Dania: sed, *secundum Chronicas, Sialandia, Lalandia, Falstria et Meonia est Dania, et illas terras primo et principaliter comprehendit hoc nomen Dania*. Dan enim, a quo regnum nomen habuit, multis annis dominabatur istis insulis, antequam acquisivit Jutiam."—Ibid. p. 83. "Fuit in Upsala civitate Svethiæ rex quidam Ypper nomine, tres filios habens, quorum unus Nori, alter Œsten, tertius Dan dicebatur. Quem pater suus misit in has partes, quæ nunc dicuntur *Dacia*, ad regendum insulas quatuor, scilicet Sialand, Mön, Falster et Laland, *quæ omnes uno vocabulo nuncupabantur Withesleth*. Imperavit enim Ypper hic ab intus habitantibus, ut hanc plagam, scilicet Withesleth, filio suo Dan darent ad sedem regni. Quo facto regnavit Dan in Withesleth Sialandiæ tantum, civitatem construens Lethram nomine, quam magnis opibus ditavit."—Ann. Esrom. ibid. p. 223.

The earliest Anglo-Saxon records, speak of the *Suð*-Dene, *Norð*-Dene, *East*-Dene, *West*-Dene, and *Gar*-Dene.

The evidence, then, is in favour of the name being native; but against its being of great antiquity. It was brought by certain Gothic *Danes* to a previously *non*-Gothic (probably Lithuanic) area.

Dania, as seen in one of the previous extracts, was called *Dacia*. Did the converse ever take place? It is generally assumed that it did not. Much turns on this, connected with the ethnology of the Heruli. Procopius (Bell. Goth. ii. 15) writes—(Ἔρουλοι) ἐς τοὺς Οὐάρνους καλουμένους ἐχώρησαν. Μεθ' οὓς δὴ καὶ Δανῶν τὰ ἔθνη παρέδραμον . . ἐνθένδε τε ἐς ὠκεανὸν ἀφικόμενοι ἐναυτιλλοντο.

Jornandes, also, states that, "*Dani*, ex ipsorum (*viz.*, Scandziæ cultorum) stirpe progressi, Herulos propriis sedibus expulerunt,"—reversing the order of the expulsion.

Be this, however, as it may, we have the evidence of two writers as to the geographical and political contact between the *Danes* and *Heruli*, and this, if taken without criticism, is a reason in favour of a long *Herulian* migration from north to south.

But it is not conclusive. If the *Dani* were called *Daci*, the *Daci* may be called *Dani*, and, as it is much more certain that the Heruli came in contact with the *Dacians* of the Danube, than with the Danes of the Baltic, a reasonable objection lies against the evidence of Procopius and Jornandes. I do not say that it is conclusive. I only show that, whenever we have a lengthy migration, we have the elements of a reasonable doubt to set against it.

Even if we lay but little stress on this, we have the fact that neither Jornandes nor Procopius are satisfactory witnesses to events so distant in both place and time.

They, probably, speculated and inferred: seeing that on the Danube there were two populations with names so like as *Daci* and *Getæ*, and on the Baltic two others with names so like as *Dani* and *Gothi*, *Geatas* or *Gautas*.

But how came the similar names to run in pairs? *Danes* alone on the Baltic, and *Daci* alone on the Danube, would be nothing very remarkable. Nor yet would *Getæ* on the Danube, and *Geatas* on the Baltic. But *Getæ* side by side with *Daci* in the south, and *Dani* (called also *Daci*) side by side with *Geatas* in the north, supply a mystery.

This is a repetition of the difficulties of §§ on the *Angli* and *Werini* of Thuringia, and it is a difficulty of the gravest character that meets us too often elsewhere.

Accident is out of the question; and I admit that a *migration*, within a certain degree of probability, is the best solution of similar problems. But it must be probable; and it must stand on the phenomena which it will explain almost exclusively. Such a migration receives but little confirmation from any so-called traditions; because the very ease with which it explains the phenomena, engenders the disposition to assume

one. Hence I put the accounts of Jornandes low; because they are just the accounts which the existing state of things would call for—just as, I imagine, that the similar relations of the Isle of Wight population, the Angles, and the Saxons, did with Beda. Yet I put what may be called the pluri-presence of a population called *D-n* (or *D-c*), in geographical contact with a population called *G-t*, high; and admit it to be the best reason existing in favour of the deduction of the *Daci* and *Getæ* from the Baltic.

Yet it is not conclusive. Names may be what is conveniently called *correlative*. Thus:—

a. Let *D-n* = *coastman*, and *G-t*, a *man of the interior country* (or *vice versâ*); or—

b. Let *D-n* = *mountaineer*, and *G-t* = *lowlander* (or *vice versâ*); or—

c. Let *D-n* = *native*, and *G-t* = *foreigner* (or *vice versâ*).

Cases of this sort may easily be multiplied. Any one of them, however, shows that, wherever certain physical or social conditions involving the correlation in question occurs, corresponding names may occur also,—and that, independent of any descent or migration.

I do not say that this was the case in the present instance; having no tittle of evidence to support its application to the case before us. I only say that such an hypothesis is good against the assumption of any equally gratuitous migration.

§ LI. THE HARUDES.

This is complementary to the note in v. *Cherusci*.

Cæsar mentions the *Harudes*, as forming a part of the army of Ariovistus; and he is the first author who mentions them at all,—but says nothing about the Cherusci.

Tacitus mentions the Cherusci, but not the Harudes.

The Marmor Ancyranum has the form *Charudes*.

The change from *Ch-* to *H-* (and *vice versâ*) has often been mentioned already,—*Chatti* = *Hesse*, *Chattuarii* = *Hazzoarii*.

Form for form, I think *Harud-* is the root of the word *Cher*-usci.

If so, Cher-*usci* is an adjective, and the *-sc-* is the *-sc* in Brittisc, the *-sk-* in Dan-*ske*, and the *-ish* in self-*ish*.

If so, the population to whom it applied, must have called themselves by an *adjectival* appellation; and this is no more than the present Danes and *Swedes* do,—Dan-*ske*, Sven-*ske*.

If so, the *-d-* is omitted; and this is no more than what occurs in the form *Nor-ske*, from Nor-*d*-ske,—the fuller form being *Harudske*, or *Cherudske*.

In Beowulf and the Traveller's Song, we find mention of a town with a palace in it, called *Heorot*.

Near this *Heorot*, the *Heaðo-bardas* were defeated; a population at no great distance from the Angles—probably either the *Bards* of *Bardon*wic, or the Lango*bards* of Tacitus.

Except that the Hartz is a mountain-range rather than a town, *Heorot* = *Hartz*, of which it is the Low German form.

I also think it was the country of the *Harudes*. Also, of the Proper *Cherusci*,—though, I admit, that it carries them as far east as it is safe to do.

Hence, I consider that the *Harudes* were the *Cherusci* in the most limited sense of the term, and the *Old* Saxons the *Cherusci* in the widest; the one name being that by which they were known to their *western*, the other that by which they were known to their *eastern* neighbours; and, although their political extinction is doubtful, their diminished importance (noticed by Tacitus) may have favoured the substitution of one name for another.

The following lines justify us in placing the Cherusci so far eastward as has been done:

> Venit accola silvæ
> Bructerus Hercyniæ, latisque paludibus exit
> Cimber et ingentes Albim liquere Cherusci.
> Accipit ille preces varias, tardeque rogatus
> Annuit et magno pacem pro munere donat.
>
> Claud. De iv. Cons. Honor. 450.

The Cherusci were part of the Eastphalians (*Ostphali*) of not. in v. *Angrivarii*.

But Ptolemy places the *Harudes* in the Cimbric Chersonese, and so (perhaps) does Beowulf. This is a grave objection to the previous doctrine.

On the other hand, the notion that the *Harudes* of the army of Ariovistus came from Jutland is beset with difficulties.

§ LII. THE SEDUSII.

I can only say that these are mentioned by Cæsar as parts of the forces of Ariovistus.

§ LIII. THE COBANDI, PHUNDUSII, SIGULONES, SABALINGII, AND CHALI.

These are the tribes which Ptolemy places in the Cimbric Chersonese. They are now noticed in somewhat fuller detail than before.

The Cobandi.—The doctrine that Κοϐανδοί may have been sounded *Covandi*, and that the *-d-* may be non-radical, by which means we get at their identity with the *Chavion-es* = *Avion-es* is not illegitimate. Beyond this, there is no light thrown upon the *Cobandi*. See *Epilegomena*, §§ *Angli* and *Aviones*.

The Phundusii.—The ejection of the *Ph* and *n*, brings this near to the name of the *Eudoses* in Tacitus. Beyond this, there is no light thrown on the *Phundusii.*—See *Epilegomena*, § *Angli*.

On the *Sigulones, Sabalingii*, and *Chali*, there is neither light nor speculation beyond what has been suggested.—See *Epilegomena*, § *Angli*.

Ptolemy's details for the so-called Cimbric Chersonese, are fuller than those of any other writer.

This may be a reason for their singularity.

Another may lie in the fact of his information being referable to a Slavonic or Keltic source rather than a German.

§ LIV. THE PHARODINI.

The *Pharodini* are placed by Ptolemy between the rivers *Chalusus* (*Trave?*) and *Suebus* (*Oder?*).

Zeuss suggests that the true form of the name is Σφαραδεινοί.

In which case, he considers that *Pharodini* = *Suardon*-es (Σφαροδειν-οί, Σφάρδων-ες).

If so, we have a locality for the latter.

If not, we have two populations known by their name only.—See *Epilegomena*, § *Angli*, and not. in v. *Suardones*.

§ LV. THE PHIRÆSI (Φιραῖσοι).

These are placed by Ptolemy in Scandinavia.

I think it is only a slightly modified form of the word *Frisii*.

No objections lie against this from their situation being so far north.

That the Frisii of Jutland are no new intruders has been shown.—See not. in v. *Frisii*.

How far traces of them occur in the *north* of Jutland has not been shown. It was a point reserved.

As far north as the Liimfjord, we find a Skjerr-*um*-bro.

This gives us a hypothesis for the diffusion of the Gothic population in Scandinavia, where these were early intruders.

The original population of all Scandinavia was, probably, *Finn*.

Next to these came Lithuanian *G-t*, who settled on the coast sufficiently to give their names to—

α. *Goth*-land—

β. *With*-esland = Sealand, Mön, Falster, and Fyen—

γ. *Jut*-land—their direction being *westerly*.

On the principle of not multiplying causes unnecessarily, they are not to be carried too far inland.

From the Frisians of Jutland came the Φιραῖσοι of Ptolemy, probably, between the northern part of the Christiania Fiord and the Miösen.

From this point the Finns were displaced by movements east and west; and the Lithuanians by movements southwards.

This I infer from one of the *northern* districts of Sweden being named *Suder*-mannia; those parts being at one time the southern boundary of the conquerors from the north. The

most northern province of Scotland is called *Suther*-land, from the same relation to Norway.

It was, probably, amongst the *Φιραῖσοι* of Ptolemy that the Norse tongue as opposed to the Frisian was developed.

What *time* was required for this? It is difficult to say. Not, *necessarily*, a very long one.

One of the great distinctive grammatical characters of the Norse is the so-called passive voice. We know that this has been evolved nearly within the literary period of Scandinavia.

The other is the *post*-positive article, Now this exists in Wallachian; though it did not in Latin, *i.e.*, Lat. *ille* homo = Wall. hom-*ul*. The reign of Trajan, therefore, is early enough for the one form. Such being the case, no longer period is needed for the second.

The time, however, *may* have been much longer—but I only indicate a *minimum*.

Again—there may have been other Frisians than the *Φιραῖσοι* of Ptolemy: but I only take what I find.

Throughout this argument we must remember—

That Goth, as a German name for the Swedes of Gothland, is a restricted and particular one—so specific as to account for the name Gothland only; whereas—

Goth, as a Lithuanic term, is wide and general, and accounts for the names Gothland and Jutland as well.

§ LVI. THE DANDUTI, NERTEREANES, CURIONES, INTUERGI, VARGIONES, AND LANDI.

What follows is the brief notice of some of those names in Strabo, Pliny, and Ptolemy, which may reasonably be applied to populations within the German area, but which have not been mentioned by other writers sufficiently to give them much historical or geographical prominence. They are, probably, the names in detail of the divisions and subdivisions of some higher groups already noticed.*

1, 2. The *Danduti* and *Nertereanes* are mentioned by

* These are the names printed in italics in the texts of Strabo, Pliny, and Ptolemy.

Ptolemy. They seem to have been south-eastern Hessians, northern Franconians, or western Thuringians; or, perhaps, populations distributed between any two or all three of those divisions—Chatti, Burgundians, or Thuringians, politically; High Germans, or Goths, ethnologically.

3. The *Curiones*, too, seem to have been on the frontier of Franconia and Thuringia; their ethnological and political conditions being those of the Nertereanes and Danduti, except that they were less Hessian. Possibly they may have been Slavonians, *i.e.*, of the Upper Maine and Regnitz.

4, 5. From Ptolemy's notice, the *Intuergi* and *Vargiones* were north-east of Wisbaden (*Vispi*); perhaps on the Upper Lahn. If so they may have been on the confines of the Platt-Deutsch and High German divisions—perhaps divided between the two.

6. Of the *Landi*, mentioned by Strabo, it can only be said that they were Germans of the great Arminian confederacy.

§ LVII. THE BATTI AND SUBATTII.

Mentioned by Strabo.

Admitting the Hessian (*Chattian*) origin of the *Bat*-avi, the *Batti* may have been the Hessians (*Chatti*), from whom it originated; and the *Su-batti* (Σου-ϐάττιοι) *South-Batti*, even as *Sus-sex* = *South-Saxon*.

If so, the name is *Low* German; and the Hessian form would be *Bessi*.

This is verified (and the suggestion is Grimm's) by the following popular distich:—

> Dissen, Deute, Haldorf, Ritte, Bune, *Besse*,
> Das sind der Hessen dörfer alle sesse;
>
> *i.e.*,
>
> Dissen, Deute, Haldorf, Ritte, Bune, *Besse*,
> They are the Hessian thorpes, all six.

§ LVIII. THE STURII, MARSACI, AND FRISIABONES.

Names, in detail, of Frisian populations; enumerated by

Pliny. Their locality is now under water; being, probably, the bottom of the Zuyder-Zee.

1. *Sturii*, seems a true proper name.

2. *Marsaci*, is, probably, a derivative from the root *Marsh* = *Marsh-men*.

3. The *Frisia-bon-es*, I think, is *Vriesen-veen* (*Frisian Fen*), a real name in more than one Frisian locality at the present moment.

As the result of a piece of guess-work, I believe that the *-v-n*, in the unsatisfactory terms Ist-æ-*von*-es and Ing-æ-*von*-es, is simply *veen*=*fen*; and the division is much more local than commentators imagine. Hence—

1. The Herminones meant the people of the Upper Ems, and water-shed between that river and the Weser.

2. The Ingævones, the Fen-people in front of it, and—

3. The Istævones, the people of a *Kesteven*, whatever the import of that name may have been.

If so, the informants of the Romans, who first circulated the terms, were in a predicament different only in degree from that of a writer about England, who at Grimsby or Boston, had heard that the whole *county* was divided into Lindsey, Holland, and *Keste-ven*, and applied his information to the British empire at large.

§ LIX. THE PARMÆCAMPI, AND ADRABÆCAMPI.

Name, compound.

Locality, the valleys of the Naab and Regen.

Power of the root, *c-mp*, uncertain. See not. in v. *Chamavi*.

But, in *origin*, probably, *German*.

To what languages, the first elements (*Parm-* and *Adrab-*) are referable, is uncertain; the displacements here having been great.

a. It may have been some Slavonic dialect, the population being a western continuation of the Saxon and Bohemian Slaves.

b. It may have been Boian (*i.e.*, Gallic or Keltic).

See nn. in vv. *Boiemum* and *Narisci*.

§ LX. TERACATRIÆ AND RACATÆ.

Compounds of the root *rac-*.

The *-t* is, perhaps, a Gallic sign of the plural.—See not. in v. *Usipii*.

To what language the root *Rac-* or (supposing the *-at* to be radical) *Racat* is referable, is doubtful.

It is, most likely, not German.

Without building anything upon the conjecture, I think that one and the same root *R-tsh*, sometimes taking the form of *Rhæt-*, sometimes of *Rug-*, sometimes of *Rak-*, and sometimes of *Racz-*, lies at the bottom of the following names.

a. The province *Rhæt*-ia,

b. The *Rug*-ii of *Rug*-i-land,

c. The Ῥάκ-αται, and Τε-ρακ-ατ-ρίαι,

d. The *Raczy* of Servia, at the present moment.

§ LXI. THE CARINI.

Mentioned by Tacitus as part of the Vindili. If so, Slavonic rather than German.

§ LXII. THE VISPI.

The names which now follow, are *equivocal*, *i.e.*, although different from those of any populations hitherto mentioned, they are, still, sufficiently like to pass as repetitions of certain names previously considered, whilst they are sufficiently different to be reasonably considered as separate substantive denominations.

The *Vispi* are the Οὐισποί of Ptolemy; who places them as far south as the frontier of the Helvetian Desert.

Probably, their name still exists in the *Wis-* of *Wis*-baden, in the country of the Mattiaci, as more than one commentator reasonably suggests. If so, their locality is fixed.

But then, their name is suspiciously like that of the

Usipetes, or *Usipii;* a population which, unless Ptolemy mention it under the name *Vispi*, he does not mention at all.

But *Wis*-baden is not too far south for the most southern *Usip*-ii. Perhaps not. We must remember, however, that they reach as far *north* as Holland, *i.e.*, the country of the *Tu-bantes* (*Twenthe*).—*Epilegomena*, § I.

§ LXIII. THE Νούσιπες.

The Νούσιπες (Νούσιποι) of Strabo; known only as we know the Landi, *i.e.*, as members of the great Arminian confederacy, or, at least, as Germans, led in triumph for the victory that avenged it.

Probably, *Usipii*, under another form; especially as the *Usipii* (as such) are not mentioned by Strabo.

§ LXIV. THE Χαῦβοι, Καοῦλκοι, Καθύλκοι, Καμψιανοὶ, Ἀμψανοί.

1. Against considering the Χαῦβοι as the *Aviones* of Tacitus, there are no great reasons. Neither are difficulties created, by making it the name of a separate substantive population.

2, 3. The other names are more problematical.

Thus,—

Besides the Καθύλκοι and Καοῦλκοι, Strabo mentions the *Chauci*, distinguishing between them and the latter. Still the names are alike,—the more so when we find *Chaucus* made trisyllabic:—

> ——— non indignante *Chaüco*
> Pascat Belga pecus.—Claudian. De Laud. Stilich.

Then there are the *Chabilci* of Gaul.—See not. in *Germania omnis.*

4, 5. Καμψιανοί and Ἀμψανοί are names suspiciously alike. Yet they both occur in the same writer—Strabo.

a. Are both, or either, Ampsi-*varii?*

b. Are both, or either, the people of the parts about *Kampten* in Over-ijsel?

c. Is one one, and the other the other?

§ LXV. THE Λαγκόσαργοι.

Such is the current reading in Strabo, who makes no mention of the Lango-*bardi.*

See note in v. Lango-*bardi.*

The word is compound, and why should there not have been three separate substantive nations with names compounded of—

1. The root *b-rd* + a prefix.

2. The root *l-ng* + an affix,—*viz.*:—

1. *Lang-o-bardi*, or the men with either *long beards* or *long halberts*—

2. *Lacco-bardi*, or the men with *beards* (or *halberts*) endowed with some quality expressed by *l-cc*—

3. *Lango-sargi*, or the men whose *sarks* (whatever they were) were *long?*

All such forms exist; certainly in good authors, possibly in good MSS.

Then there are,—

4. The *Heaþo*-bards of the Traveller's Song, and,—

5. The *Bards* of the Slavonic *Bardon*-wic.

I have no decided opinion here. It is my impression, however (and I imagine that the common sense view of the question coincides with it), that the *Langobardi*, *Acco-bardi*, and *Langosargi* are one and the same population.

The truth is, that geographical texts require a very peculiar kind of criticism.

a. We cannot prefer one reading to another, because it will give us certain results; since that (in many cases) is arguing in a circle, *i.e.*, inferring the reading from the result, and the result from the reading.

b. We cannot, as in other cases, argue from the context; since the question is one of *letters* rather than of *words;* and a proper name, in many cases, can as little be collected from the words which accompany it as the unmeaning combinations which form a chorus can from the words of a song.

The chief preliminaries to this criticism are clear notions

as to the language of the author, the language of his informants, and the language of the copyists of the MSS., especially in respect to their phonetic systems.

Now, it is not stating too much to say that all this constitutes a wholly new and undeveloped line of criticism.

That different authors should differ in the forms they give the different new and strange names which they meet with in the geography of imperfectly known countries is natural; but that one and the same author should vary is strange. Yet such has been the case with both Strabo and Ptolemy, and that to a considerable extent.

§ LXVI. THE Τέγκεροι, Ἰγρίωνες, Καριτνοί, and Τούρωνοι.

1, 2. How far are the first two *Tencteri* and *Angrivarii*? The localities are not exactly the same, nor yet the names, though like.

This answer is, probably, in the affirmative.

3. The *Caritni*, on the other hand, can scarcely be the *Carini* of Pliny, since the *Caritni* are east of the Middle Rhine, the *Carini* Vindili.

4. The Τούρωνοι are almost certainly *Thur*-ingians, of the *Teur-io-hemum* (Τευριοχαῖμαι) of Ptolemy.

§ LXVII. ON THE RELATIONS OF THE GETÆ TO INDIA.

The notice of the comparative uniformity of the Russian dialects, although apparently a point of Slavonic, rather than German, ethnology, was shown* to have an important bearing upon the text of even the *Germania* of Tacitus. And this is the case with several other questions, which, at first view, seem wholly remote from the subjects under present consideration. Nothing, however, in ethnology is isolate and unconnected; and few points of the earth's surface are so distant as not, when certain problems are under notice, to be brought to bear upon each other.

Now the case which was made out in the § on the *Goths*,

* See *Prolegomena*, § vi.

for bringing the great Lithuanian family as far south as the parts about Gallicia, on one side, and the Lower Danube, or country of the Getæ, on the other, was incomplete; since there was another series of facts which, difficult and mysterious as they are under any point of view, are still rendered somewhat clearer by every fact which extends the Lithuanic area, either *southwards* or *eastwards*.

Whatever brings *Lithuania* nearer to *India*, diminishes certain philological and ethnological difficulties.

What these are, is now widely known. They are all referable to the single great fact of the grammatical and glossarial affinities of the ancient literary language of India and Persia (the Sanskrit and its allied forms), being with the Greek and Latin, with the Gothic, with the Slavonic, and, pre-eminently, with the *Lithuanic* tongues of *Europe*.

No table, equally short, shows this better than the following one of Dr. Trithen's, from the Transactions of the Philological Society, No. 94.

ENGLISH.	LITHUANIC.	RUSSIAN.	SANSKRIT.
Mother	motina	mat'	mâtr.
Son	sunai	suin	sûnu.
Brother	brolis	brat	bhratr.
Sister	sessu	sestra	svasr.
Daughter-in-law	—	snokha	snushâ.*
Father-in-law	—	svekor†	s'vasúra.
Mother-in-law	—	svekrov' ‡	s'vas ru.
Brother-in-law	—	dever' §	devr.
One	wienas	odin	eka.
Two	du	dva	dvâ.
Three	trys	tri	tri.
Four	keturi	chetuire	chatvârah.
Five	penki	piat'	pancha.
Six	szessi	shest'	shash.
Seven	septyni	sedm'	saptan.
Eight	asstu°ni	osm'	ashtan.
Nine	dewyni	deviat'	navan.
Ten	dessimtis	desiat'	dasa'.

The following similarities go the same way, *viz.*, towards

* Latin *nurus*, from *snurus*.

† Latin *socer*, Greek ἑκυρος.

‡ Latin *socrus*, Greek ἑκυρα.

§ Latin *levir* (*devir*), Greek δαήρ.

the proof of a remarkable affinity with certain languages of Europe, there being none equally strong with any existing and undoubted Asiatic ones.

ENGLISH.	LITHUANIC.	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.
I	ass	aham	azem.
Thou	tu	twam	tŭm.
Ye	yus	yŭyam	yŭs.
The *	tas	ta-*d*	tad.
—	szi	sah˙	ho.

LITHUANIC.

Laups-inni = *I praise.*

Present.

1. Laups	-innu	-innawa	-inname.
2. —	-inni	-innata	-innata.
3. —	-inna	-inna	-inna.

SANSKRIT.

Jaj-ami = *I conquer.*

Present.

1. Jaj	-āmi	-āvah	-āmah.
2. —	-ăsi	-ăthah	-ătha.
3. —	-ăti	-ătah	-anti.

LITHUANIC.

Esmi = *I am.*

1. Esmi	eswa	esme.
2. Essi	esta	esti.
3. Esti	esti	esti.

SANSKRIT.

Asmi = *I am.*

1. Asmi	swah	smah.
2. Asi	sthah	stha.
3. Asti	stah	santi.

In explanation of this, the voice of comparative philologists, ethnologists, and special scholars, is all one way. It is unanimous in the decided expression of the doctrine that the tongues of Europe allied to the Sanskrit came from the East; and I doubt whether any man living has ever recognised the opposite alternative, *viz.*, that of the Sanskrit and its allied

* Or *that, this.*

languages coming from Europe. Of course, there are reasons for this one-sidedness, and, amongst these, the reasonable doctrine that the human species originated in Asia, the somewhat crude notion that migrations move from east to west, rather than from west to east, as if in obedience to some ethnological law, and the unwillingness to believe that the primary migrations by which the population of the earth's surface spread from some single point over the four quarters of the world, lie far beyond any existing means of investigation, are the chief.

Nevertheless, if we clear our minds of all this, the presumptions are the other way.

When two allied populations, covering areas of different magnitudes, are separated from each other, and we account for the separation by assuming a migration, the presumption is that the occupants of the smaller area are derived from that of the larger, rather than *vice versâ*.

When an ethnological class falls into a certain number of divisions, the portion of its area, where the divisions are the most numerous and the most definite, must be considered as the oldest.

Such are the *presumptions*—presumptions which we get at by attending to the first principles of reasoning—presumptions which our common-sense supplies us with. No one, I imagine, will deny their *general* validity, however much he may consider that, in certain individual cases, they give us a wrong result.

Thus, *taken by itself*, the presumption that arises from the vast extent over which the English language is spoken in America, as compared with the limited area of the British Isles, is in favour of the American being the mother-tongue, which is known to be contrary to fact.

But the mere question of a magnitude of area need not be *taken by itself*. It is corrected by the presumption arising out of the second observation. In America, the English language stands either alone or nearly so. In England it has its *congeners* around it,—Frisian, Dutch, Platt-Deutsch, High German, and Norse; and this shows that Europe is the older home of the Englishman.

Such is the case where the two presumptions differ—one complicating the other. Yet even then the case is clear.

When they coincide, it is clearer still. Thus, when we have a comparatively homogeneous language confined to the smaller of two areas on one side, and on the other a multiplicity of divisions and subdivisions spread over the larger, the presumption that the occupants of the former are derived from those of the latter, is indefinitely raised.

To apply these rules to the present case—

Northern India, Persia, Armenia, and a small portion of Caucasus, form the *maximum* of area that can be given to the so-called Indo-European languages of Asia.

England, Germany, Holland, two thirds of Scandinavia, Russia, Poland, and all southern Europe, with the exception of Rumelia, Albania, and Biscay, form the *minimum* of area for the so-called Indo-European languages of Europe.

Now the *least* that is allowed to the tongues of Europe is more than the *most* that can be given to those of Asia. The excess may be but small; still, *pro tanto*, it shows which way the presumption is.

Again—the *greatest* amount of division that can be got out of the Asiatic class of Indo-European tongues is the Ossetic, Armenian, and Indo-Persian tongues; the latter meaning the Sanskrit and the ancient languages allied to it, with their real or supposed derivatives—the modern tongues of Persia and northern India.

The *least* amount of division amongst the European tongues is equal to this; for I submit that the differences between the Latin (with its derivatives) and the Greek, the Slavonic, the Lithuanic, and the several branches of the Gothic stock, are fully equal in value and variety to those that any principle of classification can get from the tongues of Indo-European Asia.

But more must be added. Rightly or wrongly, there is an opinion that the modern languages of northern India are not Indo-European; and—

Rightly or wrongly, there is an opinion that the Armenian is not Indo-European—

Yet no one, who admits the term at all, has ever taken exceptions to any of the Indo-European tongues of Europe.

So that to derive the German, Slavonic, Lithuanic, Greek and Latin from India, is to derive the greater from the less, the multiform from the simple, the admitted from the doubtful. It is to deduce the stock from the offshoot, to move the earth with a lever in the clouds.*

All such connections as that between the Sanskrit and

* I must be allowed to remind the reader that from a desire to deal with the question as a question of logic only, and with the wish to understate, rather than overstate, my case, I argue entirely *ex abundanti*.

Thus—

a. I allow the Vedas to be four thousand years old—without believing anything of the kind.

b. I allow the Hindu, Bengali, Urdu, Gujerati, Mahratta, and modern Persian tongues, to be as truly Sanskritic in origin as the English is Anglo-Saxon—without believing it.

c. I allow the Armenian to be Indo-European.

d. Also the Ossetic. The only facts respecting these last three points which I argue from, is the *existence* of doubts—not the validity of them.

e. I lay no stress on the statement that the third language of the cuneiform inscription is other than Indo-European.

f. I carry the traces of a Tamulian tongue, anterior to the Hindu, no further south than the parts about Bombay—

g. And the traces of monosyllabic tongues, similarly anterior to the Sanskrit, no further south than the Lower Ganges.

h. I allow the Siaposh to be as Sanskritic as the most extreme defenders of its Sanskritic origin make it, and I place the Lughmani, and other dialects, as well as the Pustú of Affghanistan, in the same category.

i. I lay no stress on the Tamulian character of the Brahúi, the numerals of which were admitted by Lassen to be those of Southern India.

On the other hand—

As I take exceptions to the Indo-European character of the Keltic tongues, and although I am, perhaps, the only philologist who does, I take no advantage of the current opinion, by which the contrast between the differences between the so-called Indo-European tongues of Europe and the comparative homogeneousness of those of Asia would be heightened.

I wish to reduce the question to its logical form which is, that *where we have two branches of the same division of speech separated from each other, one of which is the larger in area and the more diversified by varieties, and the other smaller and comparatively homogeneous, the presumption is in favour of the latter being derived from the former, rather than the former from the latter.* To deduce the Indo-Europeans of Europe from the Indo-Europeans of Asia, in ethnology, is like deriving the reptiles of Great Britain from those of Ireland in erpetology.

Lithuanic must be explained by either a migration, or an original continuity of area.

The presumptions have been determined. Let us now choose between these alternatives.

The Indo-European population may have been continued from Asia into Europe (or *vice versâ*) by two lines—

1. One to the *north*—

2. One to the *south* of the Caspian Sea.

The difficulties, each way, are the same in amount, though different in kind.

1. On the north we have the vast tracts of Independent Tartary, the water-systems of the Lower Jaik and Volga, in which the Indo-European population which, by assumption, was continuous from the Oxus to the Dnieper, has wholly disappeared. Now the more we go back the wider this interval becomes; since, the Russians, at the beginning of the historical period were further from India than they are now. The supposed displacement, then, in this quarter must have been enormous. The further objections that arise out of the distribution of the existing Turk and Ugrian families of the area in question (a distribution which makes it almost impossible for an Indo-European population ever to have been on the north of the Caspian), are too numerous for a work like the present.

2. A prolongation of the Indo-European area in the direction of Asia, and to the south of the Caspian, is, at the first view, practicable enough. And here the remark that whatever brings *Lithuania nearer to India diminishes difficulties*, has its bearing. Let the Getæ be Lithuanians, the Thracians may be Lithuanic also, since more than one good authority of antiquity identifies the two. Then the Bithynians were Thracians—which brings the European Lithuanic half-way, or more, to meet the Indo-European dialects of Western Persia. Be it so. The Armenian language is a stumbling-block. It ought, from its geography, to be intermediate to the Sanskrit and Lithuanic — whereas, that it is Indo-European at all is more than many good judges allow it to be. At any rate, it is not what it ought to be for the hypothesis—transitional in character.

Such the difficulties attending the doctrine of an *original continuity of area and subsequent displacement.*

The other alternative, or that of simple migration, requires three facts to be borne in mind—

a. That it is no further from the Dardanelles to the Indus than from the Indus to the Dardanelles.

b. That the real conquests of Alexander (especially that which led to the establishment of the Greek kingdom of Bactria) differed from such a European conquest as is necessary to account for all the phenomena of the Sanskrit and allied languages in date, magnitude, and duration only—*i.e.*, in *degree* though not in *kind.*

c. That the Majiar conquest of Hungary differs only in date; for, certainly, it would be a bold statement to assert that a similar conquest of an area of equal magnitude on the Indus, on the part of the Europeans of Thrace and the Lower Danube, at a sufficiently early date, would not account for all the points of likeness between the Hindu and the European. The likelihood of such an event happening, is measured by the actual conquests of the Macedonians.

Such is the balance of the difficulties of the two hypotheses; the conclusion in the mind of the present writer being that if we consider the Sanskrit to be Asiatic, in the way that the Majiar is European, we escape the unnecessary multiplication of causes, and avoid assumptions of which the number and amount has never been fairly measured.

How far the *Jats* of India are *Get-æ*, is a difficult question. The magnitude of the area in which the coincidence occurs is quite large enough to allow us to consider it accidental. Still, a case may be made out the other way.

§ LXVIII. ON THE QUASI-GERMANIC GAULS.

By *Quasi*-Germanic I mean those Gauls who, by some writer or other of antiquity, have been considered to either be German or to exhibit German characteristics.

They are chiefly noticed in Tacitus, in § xxviii., being the *Treviri*, *Nervii*, *Vangiones*, *Triboci*, and *Nemetes.*

Between these Tacitus draws the distinction (indicated in p. 100) by the words *haud dubie;* from which I infer that, in the case of the first two populations, on this list, to which the words do *not* apply, there *was a doubt.*

I do not, then, press the arguments against the Germanic character of the Vangiones, Triboci, and Nemetes—though some serious elements of doubts are opposed to them. Thus—

a. The name of the *Tri*-boci is Keltic = the *tre*- in the Keltic names of places. But this Grimm has met by supposing it = *three*, so that *Tri-boci* = *the three beeches.*

b. The names * of three out of seven of their towns are Keltic—Ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀβρίγγα ποταμοῦ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν καλεῖται Γερμανία ἡ ἄνω· ἐν ᾗ πόλεις ἀρχομένων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀβρίγγα ποταμοῦ,

Νεμητῶν μὲν, Νοιόμαγος,
Ῥουφιάνα·
Οὐαγγιόνων δὲ, Βορβητόμαγος,
Ἀργεντόρατον,
Λεγίων ἡ Σεβαστή.
Τριβόκκων δὲ, Βρευκόμαγος,
Ἔλκηβος.—Ptolemy.

Still the three German towns may have had Keltic names in the mouths of Keltic informants.

However, the Keltic forms *Caer*, as in *Caer*-philly, occur as well—" Tutor Trevirorum copias, recenti Vangionum, *Cæracatium*, Tribocorum delectu auctas, veterano pedite atque equite firmavit . .; mox ubi duces exercitusque Romani propinquabant, honesto transfugio rediere, secutis Tribocis, Vangionibusque et *Cæracatibus*."—Tac. Hist. iv. 70.

The *Treviri* and *Nervii* come under a different category.

Respecting the first the statement of Niebuhr, that their language was German, confidently as it is made, proves nothing. It assumes the point under investigation. The unlikelihood of the Gallic having maintained itself until the time of St. Jerome, is a matter for the reader to decide. The German of *Sette* and *Tredice Communi* (*Prolegomena*, § xi.) has maintained itself longer. The fact of no mention being made of

* Those ending in *-magus.*

the *Galatian* language, on the day of Pentecost, *is* a reason —as far as it goes.

Another remark of Niebuhr's upon St. Jerome's statement is exceptionable. He considers that the supposed *German* of Phrygia was introduced by the Goths of the reign of Theodosius. Now their language would be Mœso-Gothic; *at least*, as different from the German of the Lower Rhine, the only German likely to be spoken at Treves, as the present Dutch is from the High German of Switzerland and Bavaria. This difference is that of two mutually unintelligible tongues.

The supposed descent of the Nervii from the Teutones and Cimbri, complicated as it is by the similar claim on the part of the Aduatici (see not. in v. *Nervii*) is available only in the hands of a writer who can throw any light over the deep gloom that invests the history of those famous warriors.

Still, there is the evidence of Tacitus to their being less Gallic, and more German than the typical Gauls.

This evidence we shall find is a reproduction of that of Cæsar — for which see *Prolegomena*, p. lxxii. — where the two chief texts are marked in Italics, *Belgas esse ortos ab Germanis*, and *Pæmanos qui uno nomine Germani appellantur*.

To this—as an argument the same way—we may add the present existence of the Flemish language in Belgium subject to the certainty of Flanders having been conquered by the Franks in the time of Clovis, and the likelihood of their language having been then (and no earlier) introduced.

Such is the evidence on one side. Against it must be placed the general tone of Cæsar's narrative, where the identification of the Belgæ with the Gauls in all essentials, stands in opposition to the exceptional statements as to the particular Germanism of the Pæmani, &c.

But this is, perhaps, neutralized by the fact of his treating the Aquitanians who belonged to the Iberic stock, in a similar manner, *i.e.*, as Gauls.

The presence of Belgæ in Britain, is also in favour of the Belgæ being Gauls; since the evidence of *Germans* on the other side of the Channel, in the time of Cæsar, is eminently imperfect, *i.e.*, the legitimate evidence. Of course, by making the Belgæ of the Continent German, we can bring Germans

into Britain. But that, again, is to assume the point instead of proving it.

Some, at least, of the Belgæ, were Gallic in regard to their constitution,—witness the *Eburones*, who were *clientes* to the *Treviri*.

The names (*e.g.*, those beginning in *tre-* and *con-*) were *Gallic*. This is an argument which the present writer, has, at the first view, no right to use; he has so often suggested that a population speaking one language, might have a name in another. In this case, however, he may do so; since Cæsar was in the country of the Belgæ, and, if their names were German, might have taken them in a German form. Had he never crossed the Seine, it would not have been illegitimate to argue, that Keltic names for Belgic localities and populations, were not incompatible with a Germanic descent for the people.

Neither is he, perhaps, justified in laying much stress on the degree to which the extension of Germanic tribes to the Seine, would diminish the Gallic population, supposed to be so great; since he has shown but few scruples in contrasting the Germanic. Still we must remember three points.

a. First, that the recognition of the Belgæ as German, would subtract all the country north of the Seine, from Gallia.

b. That it would place Germans on the Straits of Dover, the most probable point for the introduction of the population of Britain into Kent, a country which we know was not German but Gallic.

c. That, as the Aquitanians were Iberic, it would only leave the parts between the Seine and Loire for the Kelts.

In the analysis of the arguments in favour of a wide extension of Germans into Gaul, it will generally be found—

a. That, as a general question, too much importance is attached to the notion that common political relations denote common ethnological ones.

b. That certain particular expressions of Cæsar, showing that, in some of the instances before us, there were specific signs of Gallic origin, are omitted; *e.g.*, Cativolcus, a Belgian, says, "non facile *Gallos Gallis* negare potuisse."—Bell. Gall.

v. 27. Also the statement, that the mode of conducting the attack of towns, was the same with the Belgæ and the Gauls. —"*Gallorum eadem atque Belgarum oppugnatio est hæc.*"—Ibid. ii. 6.

c. That too little stress is laid upon the undoubted Gallic character of the county of Kent.

d. Too little, too, on the diminution of the Gallic area, by leaving it nothing but the parts between the Seine and Loire.

e. Above all, too little, to a passage in Strabo, stating that the differences (admitted differences) between the *Belgæ* and other Gauls were inconsiderable.

f. That sufficient importance is not attributed to the fact, of the testimony of Cæsar, not necessarily going beyond the assertion of a difference between the Galli and Germani, greater than the difference between two divisions of the same race.

g. That the Belgæ may have been Germans, just as the Manxmen and Channel Islanders are English, *i.e.*, only in regard to their politics.

Such I believe to have been the case; a belief which has suggested the term Quasi-Germanic.

I may here remark, that the negative statement as to political relations being but little more that *primâ facie* evidence of ethnological ones, is less easy of proof than it seems; inasmuch, as many of the instances, which the present writer could easily quote, would not satisfy an advocate of the German doctrine in its fullest extent. Many of his *Sarmatians* would be, in his eyes, Germans. Still there is no doubt as to such cases as the following.

1. A *Valerianus* and a *Martinus* are mentioned as leaders of certain *Huns*.

2. The undoubtedly Sarmatian *Jazyges* are allied in a Marcomannic war with the equally undoubtedly Germanic *Marcomanni*.

3. The *Quadi* are found in alliance with *both* undeniable Sarmatians and undeniable Germans.

In respect to the evidence of the names of the chief historical characters of a particular population, being often as diffe-

rent in language as that of the Duke of Wellington was from a Spanish private's at Salamanca, the evidence is also inconclusive, and that for the same reasons. Nevertheless, an instance more cogent than the following can scarcely be imagined.

The same writer (Tacitus) who expressly separates the *Gothini* from the Germans, and that on the strength of an express statement as to the *Gothinian* language being *Gallic*, gives us the name of a *Gothinian* leader, whose name is as unequivocally German as the eminently Germanic glosses, *Boiohemum* and *Marcomanni*. This name is Cat-*walda*, wherein the latter element is the *walda* in Bret-*walda*; whatever the first may be; concerning which, I think (notwithstanding the reasons adduced by Mr. Kemble against the *Bret-* in *Bret*-walda = *Briton*), that it is the *Goth*-, in *Goth*-ini; since the *n*- is non-radical, and reasons for the $k = g$ have been given elsewhere.

NOTES.

I.

The remarks on the extent to which a Slavonic form in *-shtsh-* might be presumed when there was a confusion between *-sc-* and *-st-* (see note in v. *Narisci*), was written before I found in L. G. Daae's work on the Lithuanian Family that the *actual* Slavonic form for the German combination *St-*, is *Shtsh* (*s'c'* in Bohemian, *szcz* in Polish, and *tcha* in Russian), and that the Polish original of *Stieglstz* is *szczygiel*. Such being the case, it is not too much to suggest that the very existence of a confusion between *-st-* and *-sc-*, is *primâ facie* evidence of the true and original form being *-shtsh-*, and consequently of the word in which it occurs being Slavonic; for it is only in Slavonic that such combinations occur.

II.

In p. 91 there is a material oversight. The Boii are placed between the Maine, Rhine, and Hercynian Forest. They ought to have been placed in the parts *beyond* the area thus circumscribed. I say this oversight is *material;* since the true position of the Boii was nearer Bohemia than the text of note in *v. Boiohemum* makes it. Still, the correction by no means carries it as far east as Bohemia; since the plain meaning of *ulteriora* is not *any* part east of the Maine, but the parts that immediately (there or thereabouts) succeed, or come next to, the Helvetian occupancy. Now, these are parts (and no inconsiderable parts either) of Bavaria. Bohemia, undoubtedly, comes afterwards in the same direction; but so do Gallicia and many other places. The commonsense interpretation seems to be that where the Helvetians left off, the Boii began. Still, the statement in the text referred to is an over-statement.

APPENDIX.

I.

*Translation of Extract from Alfred.**

"North of the old Saxons are the Obotrites, and north-east the Wylte, who are called the men of the Hevel; and east of them is the Wend Land, that is called Syssele; and south-east, at some distance, Moravia, and the Moravians have by them Thuringia and Bohemia, and part of Bavaria, and south of them, on the other side of the Danube, is Carinthia. South, as far as the mountains called Alps, and to those same mountains, lie the boundaries of Bavaria and Suabia, and east of them Carinthia. Beyond this, to the west, is Bulgaria, and east of that Greece, and east of Moravia is the land of the Vistula, and east of that Dacia, where the Goths were. To the north-east of Moravia are the Daleminzi, and north of the Daleminzi the Sorbs, and west of them the Sysele. North of Croatia (?) is the Land of Women, and north of the Land of Women is Sirmium, even to the Riphean Mountains."

II.

Translation from Thorpe's Codex Exoniensis of The Scôp, or Scald's Tale, i.e., *The Traveller's Song*.†

Widsith spake,
His word-hoard unlock'd,
Who a vast many [had met with]
Wonders on earth,
Travell'd through many nations;
Oft he had in hall receiv'd
A memorable gift.
Him from among the Myrgings,
Nobles gave birth to.
He with Ealhild,
Faithful peace-weaver,

* See *Prolegomena*, p. xxiv.

† See *Epilegomena*, § vii.

For the first time,
Of the Hreth-king,
Sought the home
East of Ongle,
Of Eormanric,
The fierce faith-breaker;
Began then much to speak:
" Of many men I 've heard,
Ruling o'er tribes;
(Every prince should
Live according to usage,
Chief after other
Rule the country,
He who in his throne
Desires to prosper).
Of these was Hwala
A while the best,
And Alexandreas
Of all most powerful
Of the race of men,
And he most prosper'd
Of those which I on earth
Have heard of.
Ætla rul'd the Huns,
Eormanric the Goths,
Becca the Banings,
The Burgends Gifica;
Cæsar rul'd the Greeks,
And Cælic the Fins,
Hagena the Holmryces,
And Henden the Gloms;
Witta rul'd the Swæfs,
Wada the Hælsings,
Meaca the Myrgings,
Mearchealf the Hundings;
Theodric rul'd the Franks,
Thyle the Rondings,
Breoca the Boundings,
Billing the Werns;
Oswine rul'd the Eows,
And the Yts Gefwulf;
Fin, Folcwald's son,
The race of Fresns,
Sigehere longest
Rul'd the Sea-Danes.
Hnæf the Hokings,
Helm the Wulfings,
Wald the Woings,
Wod the Thyrings,
Sæferth the Sycgs,
The Swedes Ongendtheow,
Sceafthere the Imbers,
Sceafa the Longbeards,
Hun the Hætwers,
And Holen the Wrosns.
Hringwald was nam'd
The Herefaras' king,
Offa rul'd Ongle,
Alewih the Danes,
Who of those men was
Haughtiest of all.
Yet not o'er Offa he
Supremacy effected,
For Offa won
Earliest of men,
Being a youth,
Of kingdoms greatest.
No one of like age with him
Dominion greater
Had in contest gain'd
With his single sword;
His marches he enlarged
Towards the Myrgings,
By Fifel-dor.
Continued thenceforth,
Engles and Swæfs,
As Offa it had won.
Hrothulf and Hrothgar
Held very long
Peace together,
The paternal cousins,
After they had expell'd
The race of Wikings,
And Ingeld's
Sword had bow'd,
Slaughter'd at Heorot
The host of Heathobeards.
Thus I travers'd many
Foreign lands,
Over the spacious earth.

Good and evil
There I proved,
From my offspring separated,
From my dear kindred far,
Follow'd widely.
Therefore I can sing,
And a tale relate,
Recount before the many
In the mead-hall,
How to me the noble of race
Were eminently kind.
I was with the Huns,
And with the Hreth-Goths,
With the Swedes and with the Geats,
And with the South-Danes;
With the Wenls I was and with the Wærns,
And with the Wikings,
With the Gefths I was and with the Wineds,
And with the Gefflegians;
With Engles I was and with Swæfs,
And with the Ænens;
With Saxons I was and with Sycgs,
And with the Sweord-Wers,
With the Hrons I was and with the Danes,
And with the Heatho-Reams,
With the Thyrings I was,
And with the Throwends,
And with the Burgends;
There I a bracelet receiv'd.
Me there Guthhere gave
A brilliant jewel,
For reward of song:
That was no sluggish king.
With the Franks I was and with the Frisians,
And with the Frumtings,
With the Rugs I was and with the Gloms,
And with the Rum-Wealhs;
Also I was in Italy
With Ælfwine,
Who had of all mankind,
To my knowledge,
The lightest hand,
Praise to effect;
The amplest heart
In the distribution of rings;
Of bright bracelets,
The child of Eadwine;
With the Serkings I was,
And with the Serings,
With Greeks I was and with Fins,
And with Cæsar,
Who o'er the joyous cities
Dominion held,
Wiolane and Wilna,
And o'er the Walish realm.
With the Scots I was and with the Picts,
And with the Scride-Fins;
With the Lid-Wikings I was and with the Leons,
And with the Longbeards;
With Hæthns and with Hæleths,
And with the Hundings;
With the Israelites I was,
And with the Ex-Syrings,
With Hebrews and with Indians,
And with the Egyptians,
With the Medes I was and with the Persians,
And with the Myrgings,
And the Mofdings,
And again with the Myrgings,
And with the Amothings;
With the East-Thyrings I was and with the Eols,
And with the Ists,
And Idumings,
And I was with Eormanric.
All which time

There to me the Gothic king
Was bounteously kind;
He me a bracelet gave,
The chieftain of his citizens,
On which six hundred were
Of beaten gold,
Sceats scored,
In shillings reckon'd
Which I to Eadgils
In possession gave
My patron-lord,
When to my home I came,
In requital to my friend,
For that he me had given land,
My father's home,
The Myrging's Lord;
And to me then Ealhild
Another gave,
The noble queen of chieftains,
Eadwine's daughter:
I her praise extended
Over many lands,
When I in song
Had to relate
Where I under heaven
Knew most bountifully
A queen with gold adorn'd
Her grace dispense.
When I and Skilling
With clear voice,
'Fore our victorious lord
Rais'd the song,
Loud to the harp
Our lay resounded.
Then many men,
Haughty of soul,
Spoke in words,
(They who well knew)
That they never song
Better had heard.
Thence I travers'd all
The country of the Goths.
Of course I ever sought
The best,—
Such was the household band
Of Earmanric.
Hethca I sought and Beadeca,
And the Herelings;
Emerca I sought and Fridla,
And the East-Goth.
Wise and good,
Unwen's father;
Secca I sought and Becca,
Seafola and Theodric,
Hetheric and Sifeca,
Hlithe and Incgentheow;
Eadwine I sought and Elsa,
Ægelmund and Hungar,
And the proud host
Of the With-Myrgings;
Wulfhere I sought and Wyrmhere:
Full oft war ceas'd not there,
When the Hræds' army,
With hard swords,
About Vistula's wood,
Had to defend
Their ancient native seat
Against the folks of Ætla.
Rædhere I sought and Rondhere,
Rumstan and Gislhere,
Withergield and Freotheric.
Wudga and Hama;
These were of comrades
Not the worst,
Though I them ever last
Should name.
Full oft from that band,
Whining flew
The yelling shaft
On the fierce nation
Where would avenge,
The chiefs adorn'd with gold,
Their men and women,
Wudga and Hama.
Thus I that have ever found,
In that journeying,
That he is ever dearest,
To the land's dwellers,

To whom God gives
Empire o'er men
To hold,
While he here lives.
Thus roving,
With their lays go
The gleemen of men
Over many lands,
Their need express,
Words of thanks utter,
Always south or north
Find one
Knowing in songs,
Liberal in gifts,
Who before his nobles desires
His grandeur to exalt,
His dignity to show,
Till that all departs,
Light and life together.
He who works praise
Has, under heaven,
Substantial glory."

III.

Paper Read at the Philological Society, February, 9th, 1844.

On the Evidence of a Connection between the Cimbri and the Chersonesus Cimbrica. By Dr. R. G. Latham.

It is considered that the evidence of any local connection between the Cimbri conquered by Marius, and the Chersonesus Cimbrica, is insufficient to counterbalance the natural improbability of a long and difficult national migration. Of such a connection, however, the identity of name and the concurrent belief of respectable writers are *primâ facie* evidence. This, however, is disposed of, if such a theory as the following can be established, *viz.*, that, for certain reasons, the knowledge of the precise origin and locality of the nations conquered by Marius was, at an early period, confused and indefinite; that new countries were made known without giving any further information; that hence, the locality of the Cimbri was always pushed forwards beyond the limits of the geographical areas accurately ascertained; and finally, that thus their supposed locality retrograded continually northwards, until it fixed in the districts of Sleswick and Jutland, where the barrier of the sea, and the increase of geographical knowledge (with one exception) prevented it from getting farther. Now this view arises out of the examination of the language of the historians and geographers as examined in order, from Sallust to Ptolemy.

Of Sallust and Cicero, the language points to Gaul as the home of the nation in question; and that without the least intimation of its being any particularly distant portion of that country. "Per idem tempus adversus Gallos ab ducibus nostris, Q. Cæpione et M. Manlio, male pugnatum—Marius consul absens factus, et ei decreta provincia Gallia."—Bell. Jugurth. 114. "Ipse ille Marius—influentes in Italiam Gallorum maximas copias repressit."—Cicero de Prov. Consul. 13. And here an objection may be anticipated. It is undoubtedly true that even if the Cimbri had originated in a locality so distant as the Chersonese, it would have been almost impossible to have made such a fact accurately understood. Yet it is also true, that if any material difference had existed between the Cimbri and the Gauls of Gaul, such must have been familiarly known in Rome, since slaves of both sorts must there have been common.

Cæsar, whose evidence ought to be conclusive (inasmuch as he knew of Germany as well as of Gaul), fixes them to the south of the Marne and Seine. This we learn, not from the direct text, but from inference: "Gallos—a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit."—Bell. Gall. i. 1. "Belgas—solos esse qui, patrum nostrorum memoria, omni Gallia vexata, Teutones Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerint."—Bell. Gall. ii. 4. Now if the Teutones and Cimbri had moved from north to south, they would have clashed with the Belgæ first, and with the other Gauls afterwards. The converse, however, was the fact. It is right here to state, that the last observation may be explained away by supposing either that the Teutones and Cimbri here meant may be a *remnant* of the confederation on their *return*, or else a portion that settled down in Gaul upon their way; or finally, a division that made a circle towards the place of their destination in a south-east direction. None of these, however, seem the plain and natural construction; and I would rather, if reduced to the alternative, read *Germania* instead of *Gallia*, than acquiesce in the most probable of them.

Diodorus Siculus, without defining their locality, deals throughout with the Cimbri as a Gaulish tribe. Besides this, he gives us one of the elements of the assumed indistinctness

of ideas in regard to their origin, *viz.*, their hypothetical connection with the Cimmerii. In this recognition of what might have been called the *Cimmerian theory*, he is followed by Strabo and Plutarch.—Diod. Sicul. v. 32. Strabo, vii. Plutarch. Vit. Marii.

The next writer who mentions them is Strabo. In confirmation of the view taken above, this author places the Cimbri on the northernmost limit of the area geographically known to him, *viz.*, *beyond* Gaul and *in* Germany, between the Rhine and the Elbe: *Τῶν δὲ Γερμάνων, ὡς εἶπον, οἱ μὲν προσάρκτιοι παρηκοῦσι τῷ Ὠκεανῷ. Γνωρίζονται δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ῥήνου λάβοντες τὴν ἀρχὴν μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιος. Τούτων δὲ εἰσὶ γνωριμώτατοι Σούγαμβροί τε καὶ Κίμβροι. Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ἄλβιος τὰ πρὸς τῷ Ὠκεανῷ παντάπασιν ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ἐστιν.*—Lib. iv. Further proof that this was the frontier of the Roman world we get from the statement which soon follows, *viz.*, that "thus much was known to the Romans from their successful wars, and that more would have been known had it not been for the injunction of Augustus forbidding his generals to cross the Elbe." —Lib. iv.

Velleius Paterculus agrees with his contemporary Strabo. He places them beyond the Rhine, and deals with them as Germans:—"Tum Cimbri et Teutoni transcendere Rhenum, multis mox nostris suisque cladibus nobiles."—ii. 8. "Effusa —immanis vis Germanarum gentium quibus nomen Cimbris ac Teutonis erat."—Ibid. 12.

From the *Germania* of Tacitus a well-known passage will be considered in the sequel. Tacitus's locality coincides with that of Strabo.

Ptolemy.—Now the author who most mentions in detail the tribes beyond the Elbe is also the author who most pushes back the Cimbri towards the north. Coincident with his improved information as to the parts southward, he places them at the extremity of the area known to him: *Καῦχοι οἱ μείζονες μέχρι τοῦ Ἀλβίος ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ αὔχενα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσόνησον ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξονας, Σιγούλωνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν· εἶτα Σαβα-*

λίγγιοι, εἶτα Κοβανδοί· ὑπὲρ οὓς Χάλοι· καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδούσιοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαροῦδες, πάντων δὲ ἀρκτικώτεροι Κίμβροι.—Ptolemæi Germania.

Such is the evidence of those writers, Greek or Roman, who deal with the local habitation of the Cimbri rather than with the general history of that tribe. As a measure of the indefinitude of their ideas, we have the confusion, already noticed, between the Cimbri and Cimmerii, on the parts of Diodorus, Strabo and Plutarch. A better measure occurs in the following extract from Pliny, who not only fixes the Cimbri in three places at once, but also (as far as we can find any meaning in his language) removes them so far northward as Norway: "Alterum genus Ingævones; quorum pars Cimbri, Teutoni, ac Chaucorum gentes. Proximi Rheno Istævones; quorum pars Cimbri mediterranei."—iv. 28. "Promontorium Cimbrorum excurrens in maria longe peninsulam efficit, quæ Cartris appellatur."—Ibid. 27. "Sevo Mons (the mountain-chains of Norway) immanem ad Cimbrorum usque promontorium efficit sinum, qui Codanus vocatur, refertus insulis, quarum clarissima Scandinavia est, incompertæ magnitudinis."—Ibid. Upon confusion like this it is not considered necessary to expend further evidence. So few statements coincide, that under all views there must be a misconception somewhere; and of such misconception great must the amount be, to become more improbable than a national migration from Jutland to Italy.

Over and above, however, this particular question of evidence, there stands a second one; *viz.* the determination of the ethnographical relations of the nations under consideration. This is the point as to whether the Cimbri conquered by Marius were Celts or Goths, akin to the Gauls, or akin to the Germans; a disputed point, and one which, for its own sake only, were worth discussing, even at the expense of raising a wholly independent question. Such, however, it is not. If the Cimbri were Kelts, the improbability of their originating in the Cimbric Chersonese would be increased, and with it the amount of evidence required; since, laying aside other considerations, the natural unlikelihood of a large area being traversed by a mass of emigrants is greatly enhanced by the fact

of any intermediate portion of that area being possessed by tribes as alien to each other as the Gauls and Germans. Hence, therefore, the fact of the Cimbri being Kelts will (if proved) be considered as making against the probability of their origin in the Cimbric Chersonese; whilst, if they be shown to be Goths, the difficulties of the supposition will be in some degree diminished. Whichever way this latter point is settled, something will be gained for the historian; since the supposed presence of Kelts in the Cimbric Chersonese has complicated more than one question in ethnography.

Previous to proceeding in the inquiry, it may be well to lay down, once for all, as a postulate, that whatever, in the way of ethnography, is proved concerning any one tribe of the Cimbro-Teutonic league, must be considered as proved concerning the remainder; since all explanations, grounded upon the idea that one part was Gothic and another part Keltic, have a certain amount of *primâ facie* improbability to set aside. The same conditions as to the burden of proof apply also to any hypothesis founded on the notion of *retiring* Cimbri *posterior* to the attempted invasion of Italy. On this point the list of authors quoted will not be brought below the time of Ptolemy. With the testimonies anterior to that writer, bearing upon the question of the ethnography, the attempt, however, will be made to be exhaustive. Furthermore, as the question in hand is not so much the absolute fact as to whether the Cimbri were Kelts or Goths, but one as to the amount of evidence upon which we believe them to be either the one or the other, statements will be noticed under the head of evidence, not because they are really proofs, but simply because they have ever been looked upon as such. Beginning then with the Germanic origin of the Cimbro-Teutonic confederation, and dealing separately with such tribes as are separately mentioned, we first find the

Ambrones.—In the Anglo-Saxon poem called the Traveller's Song, there is a notice of a tribe called *Ymbre*, *Ymbras*, or *Ymbran*. Suhm, the historian of Denmark, has allowed himself to imagine that these represent the *Ambrones*, and that their names still exists in that of the island *Amron* of the coast of Sleswick, and perhaps in *Amerland*, a part of Olden-

burg.—Thorpe's note on the Traveller's Song in the *Codex Exoniensis*.

Teutones.—In the way of evidence of there being Teutones amongst the Germans, over and above the associate mention of their names with that of the Cimbri, there is but little. They are not so mentioned either by Tacitus or Strabo. Ptolemy, however, mentions *a*) the Teutonarii, *b*) the Teutones: *Τευτονοάριοι καὶ Οὐίρουνοι—Φαραδεινῶν δὲ καὶ Συήβων, Τεύτονες καὶ Ἄμαρποι.* Besides this, however, arguments have been taken from *a*) the meaning of the rout *teut=people* (*þiuda*, Mœso-Gothic; *þeód*, Anglo-Saxon; *diot*, Old High German: *b*) the *saltus Teutobergius*: *c*) the supposed connection of the present word *Deut-sch=German* with the classical word *Teut-ones*. These may briefly be disposed of.

a.) It is not unlikely for an invading nation to call themselves *the nation*, *the nations*, *the people*, &c. Neither, if the tribe in question had done so (presuming them to have been Germans or Goths), would the word employed be very unlike *Teuton-es*. Although the word *þiud-a=nation* or *people*, is generally strong in its declension (so making the plural *þiud-ós*), it is found also in a weak form with its plural *thiot-ún= Teuton-*. See Deutsche Grammatik, i. 630.

b.) The *saltus Teutobergius* mentioned by Tacitus (Ann. i. 60) can scarcely have taken its name from a tribe, or, on the other hand, have given it to one. It means either *the hill of the people*, or *the city of the people*; according as the syllable *-berg-* is derived from *báirgs=a hill*, or from *baúrgs=a city*. In either case the compound is allowable, *e.g.* diot-*wëc*, *public way*, Old High German; thiod-*scatho*, *robber of the people*, Old Saxon; þëód-*cyning*, þeod-*mearc*, *boundary of the nation*, Anglo-Saxon; þiód-*land*, þiód-*vëgr*, *people's way*, Icelandic; —Theud-*e-mirus*, Theud-*e-linda*, Theud-*i-gotho*, proper names (from *þiud-*): *himil*-bërac, *velt*-përac, *friðu*-përac, Old High German; *himin*biörg, *val*biörg, Icelandic (from *báirgs=hill*) —*asci*purc, *hasal*purc, *saltz*purc, &c., Old High German (from *baúrgs=city*). The particular word *diot-puruc=civitas magna* occurs in Old High German.—See Deutsche Grammatik, iii. p. 478.

c.) Akin to this is the reasoning founded upon the connec-

tion (real or supposed) between the root *Teut-* in *Teuton-*, and the root *deut-* in *Deut-sch*. It runs thus. The syllable in question is common to the word *Teut-ones*, *Teut-onicus*, *Theod-iscus*, *teud-iscus*, *teut-iscus*, *tût-iske*, *dût-iske*, *tiut-sche*, *deut-sch*; whilst the word *Deut-sch* means *German*. As the *Teut-ones* were Germans, so were the Cimbri also. Now this line of argument is set aside by the circumstance that the syllable *Teut-* in *Teut-ones* and *Teut-onicus*, as the names of the confederates of the Cimbri, is wholly unconnected with the *Teut-* in *theod-iscus*, and *Deut-sch*. This is fully shown by Grimm in his dissertation on the words *German* and *Dutch*. In its oldest form the latter word meant *popular*, *national*, *vernacular*; it was an adjective applied to the *vulgar tongue*, or the vernacular German, in opposition to the Latin. In the tenth century the secondary form *Teut-onicus* came in vogue even with German writers. Whether this arose out of imitation of the Latin form *Romanice*, or out of the idea of an historical connection with the Teutones of the classics, is immaterial. It is clear that the present word *Deut-sch* proves nothing respecting the *Teutones*. Perhaps, however, as early as the time of Martial the word *Teutonicus* was used in a general sense, denoting the Germans in general. Certain it is that, before his time, it meant the particular people conquered by Marius, irrespective of origin or locality.—See Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik, i. p. 17, 3rd edit. Martial, xiv. 26, *Teutonici capilli*. Claudian. in Eutrop. i. 406, *Teutonicum hostem*.

The *Cimbri*.—Evidence to the Gothic origin of the Cimbri (treated separately) begins with the writers under Augustus and Tiberius.

Vell. Paterculus.—The testimony of this writer as to the affinities of the nations in question is involved in his testimony as to their locality, and consequently subject to the same criticism. His mention of them (as Germans) is incidental.

Strabo.—Over and above the references already made, Strabo has certain specific statements concerning the Cimbri: *a*.) That according to a tradition (which he does not believe) they left their country on account of an inundation of the sea. This is applicable to Germany rather than to Gaul. This

liability to inundations must not, however, be supposed to indicate a locality in the Cimbric Chersonese as well as a German origin, since the coast between the Scheldt and Elbe is as obnoxious to the ocean as the coasts of Holstein, Sleswick, and Jutland. *b.*) That against the German Cimbri and Teutones the Belgæ alone kept their ground—*ὥστε μόνους* (*Βέλγας*) *ἀντέχειν πρὸς τὴν τῶν Γερμάνων ἔφοδον, Κίμβρων καὶ Τευτόνων.*—iv. 3. This is merely a translation of Cæsar (see above) with the interpolation *Γερμάνων*. *c.*) That they inhabited their original country, and that they sent ambassadors to Augustus—*καὶ γὰρ νῦν ἔχουσι τὴν χώραν ἣν εἶχον πρότερον, καὶ ἔπεμψαν τῷ Σεβαστῷ δῶρον τὸν ἱερώτατον παρ' αὐτοῖς, λέβητα, αἰτούμενοι φιλίαν καὶ ἀμνηστίαν τῶν ὑπουργημένων· τύχοντες δὲ ὧν ἠξίουν ἀφῆραν.*—Lib. i. Full weight must be given to the definite character of this statement.

Tacitus.—Tacitus coincides with Strabo, in giving to the Cimbri a specific locality, and in stating special circumstances of their history. Let full weight be given to the words of a writer like Tacitus; but let it also be remembered that he wrote from hearsay evidence, that he is anything rather than an independent witness, that his statement is scarcely reconcilable with those of Ptolemy and Cæsar, and that above all the locality which both he and Strabo give the *Cimbri* is also the locality of the *Sicambri*, of which latter tribe no mention is made by Tacitus,* although their wars with the Romans were matters of comparatively recent history. For my own part, I think, that between a confusion of the *Cimbri* with the *Cimmerii* on the one hand, and of the *Cimbri* with the *Sicambri* on the other, we have the clue to the misconceptions assumed at the commencement of the paper. There is no proof that in the eyes of the writers under the Republic, the origin of the Cimbri was a matter of either doubt or speculation. Catulus, in the History of his Consulship, commended by Cicero (Brutus, xxxv.), and Sylla in his Commentaries, must have spoken of them in a straightforward manner as Gauls, otherwise Cicero and Sallust would have spoken of them less decidedly. (See

* This ought to be " by Tacitus in his *Germania*."—R. G. L. 1851.

Plutarch's Life of Marius, and *note*). Confusion arose when Greek readers of Homer and Herodotus began to theorize, and this grew greater when formidable enemies, under the name of *Sicambri* were found in Germany. It is highly probable that in both Strabo and Tacitus, we have a commentary on the lines of Horace—

> Te cæde gaudentes Sicambri
> Compositis venerantur armis.

"Eumdem (with the Chauci, Chatti, and Cherusci) Germaniæ situm proximi Oceano Cimbri tenent, parva nunc civitas, sed gloria ingens: veterisque famæ late vestigia manent, utraque ripa castra ac spatia, quorum ambitu nunc quoque metiaris molem manusque gentis, et tam magni exercitus fidem...occasione discordiæ nostræ et civilium armorum, expugnatis legionum hibernis, etiam Gallias affectavere; ac rursus pulsi inde, proximis temporibus triumphati magis quam victi sunt." —German. 37.

Justin.—Justin writes—"Simul e *Germania* Cimbros—inundâsse Italiam." Now this extract would be valuable if we were sure that the word *Germania* came from Justin's original, Trogus Pompeius; who was a Vocontian Gaul, living soon after the Cimbric defeat. To him, however, the term *Germania* must have been wholly unknown; since, besides general reasons, Tacitus says—"Germaniæ vocabulum recens et nuper additum: quoniam, qui primum Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint, ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paullatim, ut omnes, primum a victore ob metum, mox a seipsis invento nomine *Germani* vocarentur." Justin's interpolation of *Germania* corresponds with the similar one on the part of Strabo.

Such is the evidence for the Germanic origin of the Cimbri and Teutones, against which may now be set the following testimonies as to their affinity with the Kelts, each tribe being dealt with separately.

The Ambrones.—Strabo mentions them along with the Tigurini, an undoubted Celtic tribe—Κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἄμβρωνας καὶ Τωΰγενοὺς πόλεμον.

Suetonius places them with the Transpadani—"per Ambronas et Transpadanos."—Cæsar, § 9.

Plutarch mentions that their war-cries were understood and answered by the Ligurians. Now it is possible that the Ligurians were Kelts, whilst it is certain that they were not Goths.

The Teutones.—Appian speaks of the Teutones having invaded Noricum, and this under the head Κέλτικα.

Florus calls one of the kings of the Teutones Teutobocchus, a name Keltic rather than Gothic.

Virgil has the following lines:—

> ———Late jam tum ditione premebat
> Sarrastes populos, et quæ rigat æquora Sarnus;
> Quique Rufras, Batulumque tenent, atque arva Celennæ;
> Et quos maliferæ despectant mœnia Abellæ:
> Teutonico ritu soliti torquere *cateias*.
> Tegmina queis capitum raptus de subere cortex,
> Æratæque micant peltæ, micat æreus ensis.—Æn. vii. 737—743.

Now this word *cateia* may be a provincialism from the neighbourhood of Sarraste. It may also (amongst other things) be a true Teutonic word. From what follows, it will appear that this latter view is at least as likely as any other. The commentators state that it is *vox Celtica* That this is true may be seen from the following forms—Irish: *ga, spear, javelin; gaoth, ditto, a dart; goth, a spear* (O'Reilly); *gaothadh, a javelin; gadh, spear; gai, ditto; crann gaidh, spear-shaft* (Begly)—Cornish: *geu, gew, gu, gui* = *lance, spear, javelin, shaft* (Pryce)—Breton: *goas, goaff* (Rostremer).

Considering the peculiarities of the Keltic pronunciation, this word *cateia* is perhaps the *gæsum* of another part of Virgil, and the ὑσσ-ός of Appian, as well as the English word *goad.*

The Cimbri—The Teutones.—Of either the Cimbri separately, or of the Cimbri and Teutones collectively, being of Gallic origin, we have, in the way of direct evidence, the testimonies exhibited above, *viz.*, of Sallust, Cicero, Cæsar, Diodorus. To this may be added, that of Dion Cassius, who not only had access to the contemporary accounts which spoke of them as Gauls, but also was enabled to use them critically, being possessed of information concerning Germany as well as France.

Of Appian the whole evidence goes one way, *viz.*, that the tribes in question were Gauls. His expressions are: *πλεῖστον τε καὶ μαχιμώτατον—χρῆμα* Κελτῶν *εἰς τὴν* Ἰταλίαν *καὶ τὴν* Γαλατίαν *εἰσέβαλε.*—iv. 2. In his book on Illyria he states, that the Kelts and Cimbri, along with the Illyrian tribe of the Autariæ, had, previous to the battle against Marius, attacked Delphi and suffered for their impiety. —Ἰλλυρ. δ'. 4.

Quintilian may be considered to give us upon the subject the notions of two writers—Virgil, and either Cæsar or Crassus. In dealing, however, with the words of Quintilian, it will be seen that there are two assumptions. That either Cæsar or Crassus considered the Cimbri to be Gauls, we infer from the following passage: "Rarum est autem, ut oculis subjicere contingat (*sc.* vituperationem), ut fecit C. Julius, qui cum Helvio Manciæ sæpius obstrepenti sibi diceret, *jam ostendam, qualis sis:* isque plane instaret interrogatione, qualem se tandem ostensurus esset, digito demonstravit imaginem *Galli* in scuto Mariano *Cimbrico* pictam, cui Mancia tum simillimus est visus. Tabernæ autem erant circum Forum, ac scutum illud signi gratia positum."—Inst. Orat. vi. 3, 38. Pliny tells the story of Crassus (xxxix. 4). Although in this passage the word upon which the argument turns has been written *galli*, and translated *cock*, the current interpretation is the one given above.—Vid. not. ed. Gesner.

In the same author is preserved the epigram of Virgil's called Catalecta, and commented on by Ausonius of Bordeaux. Here we learn that T. Annius *Cimber* was a Gaul; whilst it is assumed that there was no other reason to believe that he was called *Cimber* than that of his being descended from some slave or freedman of that nation:—" Non appareat affectatio, in quam mirifice Virgilius,

> Corinthiorum amator iste verborum
> Ille iste rhetor: namque quatenus totus
> Thucydides Britannus, Atticæ febres,
> *Tau*-Gallicum, *min-*, *al-* spinæ male illisit.
> Ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.

Cimber hic fuit a quo fratrem necatum hoc Ciceronis dictum

notatum est; *Germanum Cimber occidit*."—Inst. Orat. viii. 3. *cum not.*

> Dic, quid significent Catalecta Maronis? in his *al-*
> Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidius *tau-*,
> Et quod Germano mistum male letiferum *min-*.—Auson.

Undoubtedly the pronunciation here ridiculed is that of the Gauls, and it is just possible, that in it is foreshadowed the curtailed form that the Latin tongue in general puts on in the French. Again, the slave whose courage failed him when ordered to slay Caius Marius, is called both a Gaul and a Cimbrian by Plutarch, as well as by Lucan. In the latter writer, we have probably but a piece of rhetoric.—Pharsalia, lib. ii.

Amongst tribes undoubtedly Gallic, the Nervii claimed descent from the Teutones and Cimbri. The passage of Tacitus that connects the Nervii with the *Germans*, connects them also with the Treviri. Now a well-known passage in St. Jerome tells us that the Treviri were Gauls:—Νέρϐιοι ἦσαν δὲ Κίμϐρων καὶ Τευτόνων ἀπόγονοι.—Appian, iv. 1, 4. "Treviri et Nervii circa affectationem Germanicæ originis ultro ambitiosi sunt, tamquam per hanc gloriam sanguinis, a similitudine et inertia Gallorum separentur."—German. 28. Finally, in the Life of Marius by Plutarch, we have dialogues between the Cimbri and the Romans. Now a Gallic interpreter was probable, but not so a German one.

Such are the notices bearing upon the ethnography of the Cimbri. Others occur, especially amongst the poets; of these, little or no use can be made, for a reason indicated above. Justin speaks of embassies between Mithridates and the Cimbri. Suetonius connects the Cimbri with the Gallic Senones; he is writing, however, about Germany, so that his evidence, slight as it is, is neutralized. Theories grounded upon the national name may be raised on both sides; *Cimbri* may coincide with either the Germanic *kempa* = *a warrior* or *champion*, or with the Keltic *Cymry* = *Cambrians*. Equally equivocal seem the arguments drawn from the descriptions either of their physical conformation or their manners. The silence of the Gothic traditions as to the Cimbri being Germanic, proves more in the way of negative evidence than the

similar silence of the Keltic ones, since the Gothic legends are the most numerous, and the most ancient. Besides this, they deal very especially with genealogies, national and individual. The name of Bojorix, a Cimbric king mentioned in Epitome Liviana (lxvii.), is Keltic rather than Gothic, although in the latter dialects proper names ending in *-ric* (*Alaric*, *Genseric*) frequently occur.

Measuring the evidence, which is in its character essentially cumulative, consisting of a number of details unimportant in themselves, but of value when taken in the mass, the balance seems to be in favour of the Cimbri, Teutones and Ambrones being Gauls rather than Germans, Kelts rather than Goths.

An argument now forthcoming stands alone, inasmuch as it seems to prove two things at once, *viz.*, not only the Keltic origin of the Cimbri, but, at the same time, their locality in the Chersonese. It is brought forward by Dr. Pritchard, in his Physical History of Mankind, and runs as follows:—(*a.*) It is a statement of Pliny that the sea in their neighbourhood was called by the Cimbri *Morimarusa*, or the *dead sea* = *mare mortuum.* (*b.*) It is a fact, that in Keltic Welsh *mor marwth* = *mare mortuum*, *morimarusa*, *dead sea.* Hence the language of the Cimbric coast is to be considered as Keltic. Now the following facts invalidate this conclusion:—(1.) Putting aside the contradictions in Pliny's statement, the epithet *dead* is inapplicable to either the German Ocean or the Baltic. (2.) Pliny's authority was a writer named Philemon: out of the numerous Philemons enumerated by Fabricius, it is likely that the one here adduced was a contemporary of Alexander the Great; and it is not probable that at that time glosses from the Baltic were known in the Mediterranean. (3.) The subject upon which this Philemon wrote was the Homeric Poems. This, taken along with the geography of the time, makes it highly probable that the original Greek was not Κίμβροι, but Κιμμέριοι; indeed we are not absolutely sure of Pliny having written *Cimbri*. (4.) As applied to Cimmerian sea the epithet *dead* was applicable. (5.) The term *Morimarusa* = *mare mortuum*, although good Keltic, is better Slavonic, since throughout that stock of lan-

guages, as in many other of the Indo-European tongues (the Keltic and Latin included), the roots *mor* and *mori* mean *sea* and *dead* respectively:—"Septemtrionalis Oceanus, Amalchium eum Hecatæus appellat, a Paropamiso amne, qua Scythiam alluit, quod nomen ejus gentis lingua significat congelatum, Philemon *Morimarusam** a Cimbris (qu. *Cimmeriis*) vocari scribit: hoc est *mare mortuum* usque ad promontorium Rubeas, ultra deinde *Cronium*" (13).

One point, however, still remains: it may be dealt with briefly, but it should not be wholly overlooked, *viz.*, the question, whether, over and above the theories as to the location of the Cimbri in the Cimbric Chersonese, there is reason to believe, on independent grounds, that Keltic tribes were the early inhabitants of the peninsula in question? If such were actually the case, all that has preceded would, up to a certain point, be invalidated. Now I know no sufficient reasons for believing such to be the case, although there are current in ethnography many insufficient ones.

1. In the way of philology, it is undoubtedly true that words common to the Keltic tribes occur in the Danish of Jutland, and in the Frisian and Low German of Sleswick and Holstein; but there is no reason to consider that they belong to an aboriginal Keltic tribe. The *a priori* probability of Kelts in the peninsula involves hypotheses in ethnography which are, to say the least, far from being generally recognised. The evidence as to the language of aborigines derived from the significance of the names of old geographical localities, is wanting for the Cimbric Chersonese. The arguments as to the origin from Jutland of certain Keltic tribes in England (*e.g.*, the Picts) either rest upon the historical evidence that has just been discussed, or else involve a vicious circle of argument.

2. No traditions, either Scandinavian or German, point towards an aboriginal Keltic population for the localities in question.

3. There are no satisfactory proofs of such in either archæology or natural history. A paper noticed by Dr. Pritchard of Professor Eschricht's upon certain tumuli in

* Query. *Murmora=Propontis* (R. G. L. 1851).